Rural Employment Programmes in India

The Implementation Process

R.K. Tiwari

23 DEC 1983

2725

RURAL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMMES IN INDIA

THE IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

Rural Employment Programmes in India

The Implementation Process

R.K. TIWARI

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
INDRAPRASTHA ESTATE, RING ROAD, NEW DELHI-110002

© Indian Institute of Public Administration
New Delhi-110002

Price { Indian : Rs. 150.00
Abroad : £ 24.00 $ 45.00 }

Printed at : Swatantra Bharat Press, 423 Esplanade Road,
Delhi-110006

FOREWORD

Implementation has been rightly regarded as the Achilles heel of Indian Administration. From the beginning of India's developmental process, the gap between prcmisesand performance became obvious. "We are not so expert in implementation as at planning" observed Jawaharlal Nehru more than a quarter century ago. The addresses delivered (1955-1963) by him in the Annual General Body Meetings of the Indian Institute of Public Administration provide us his vision and deep insights into administrative problems. Some of the issues highlighted by him are : democratic decentralisation, structure of administration and decision process, responsive administration, corruption in public administration, governmental procedures, task-oriented approach to work, crisis and administration and administrative delays. As a matter of fact, these issues are as relevant today as they were during his times.

In fact, a careful perusal of his addresses reveal a perspective on administrative problems of plan implementation. His observation on performance indicators, disposition of lower level functionaries, structure of administration and decision-making, political elites and development process highlight major aspects of implementation process. His contribution in providing a framework of implementation process becomes very obvious, if one compares the ideas put forth by him with conceptual framework(s) of policy implementation developed so far. It will not be out of place to mention that he was aware of the pitfalls of plan implementation in a democratic society. He laid emphasis on suitably adapting the administrative system to the social, cultural and economic needs of the society. He attached highest importance to efficiency in administration.

It is in the fitness of things that R.K. Tiwari has undertaken an in-depth study of implementation process of our rural employment programmes. Tiwari's concern in the present study is to identify the critical issues in the

implementation process. In order to identify these issues, he has rightly analysed the decision-making process at the implementation level. It is these decision-making points in the implementation process which pave way for the realisation or non-realisation of the policy objectives. In this analysis he has highlighted that performance gap in the implementation of a programme, is a combination of number of factors. I feel that this is an important study as it provides an analysis of implementation process in one of the major programmes of poverty alleviation in India. I am sure this book will help in our understanding of problems of implementation in the development process.

(P.K. UMASHANKAR)
Director
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

NEW DELHI
JANUARY 1990

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many persons have been of help to me in the preparation of this book. I want to acknowledge my indebtedness to T.N. Chaturvedi, former Director, Indian Institute of Public Administration and presently Comptroller & Auditor General of India, for encouraging me to undertake researches into the field of the rural poor and giving me benefits of his deep insight and knowledge of Indian Administration. I am grateful to my colleague S.R. Maheshwari for making critical comments on the draft of this volume. I am thankful to Kuldeep Mathur of Jawaharlal Nehru University, for his encouragement and my interactions with him have always been fruitful. My thanks also to Jaideep Singh with whom I interact frequently on a wide range of issues. K.N. Kabra and A. Datta were kind enough to give me their suggestions on a draft of the volume. My thanks are also due to Imtiaz Ahmed for providing valuable assistance in the completion of this study.

My thanks are also due to A.K. Joshi, Santosh Bakshi, Sunita Gulati and M.C. Mehrishi for not only helping me in preparation of the bibliography but also procuring for my use some books and reports on this subject. My thanks to M.K. Gaur, Om Anand and K.K. Joshi for their efforts in expediting the printing of the present work. My thanks are also due to F.C. Kohli, Ajay Verma and Jetender Mehta for their meticulous typing.

R.K. TIWARI

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
2.1	Rural Employment Programmes (1961-62—1986-87)	161
2.2	Financial Provision and Actual Expenditure	163
2.3	Pattern of Sectoral Expenditure	164
2.4	Pattern of Expenditure—Categorywise	166
2.5	Employment Generation	167
2.6	Unit Cost of Employment	168
3.1	Population in Durg and Raipur Districts	169
3.2	Profile of the Blocks Surveyed	170
5.1	Shelf of Projects 1985-86 to 1989-90—Raipur District.	171
5.2	Statement showing Proposed Number of Works, Expenditure and Grant Received during 1984-85 and upto June, 1985	172
5.3	Summary of Annual Action Plan 1984-85—Durg District.	173
5.4	Annual Action Plan-1985-86 Raipur District	176
5.5	Number of Incomplete Works in Raipur District and the Amount required for their Completion—1985-86.	178
5.6	Details of Incomplete Works during May 1985—Durg District	179
5.7	Information Regarding Incomplete Works during April 1985—Durg District	180
5.8	Statement showing Yearwise Incomplete Works 1975-76 to 1983-84—Raipur District	183

		Page
5.9	Details of Complete and Incomplete Works of the blocks surveyed—Raipur District	185
5.10	Statement showing proposed number of works, expenditure, grant received and number of complete and incomplete works during 1984-85 and 1985-86 in the blocks surveyed.	186
5.11	Details of Allotment and Expenditure to various agencies during 1984-85—Durg District.	188
5.12	Statement showing block and agencywise allotment and expenditure 1984-85—Raipur District.	189
5.13	Type of works undertaken—1981-82 to 1984-85—Durg District	190
5.14	Allotment of grant from Development Commissioner to the DRDA—1984-85 Durg District.	191
5.15	Pattern of release of grant from DRDA to agencies (other than blocks)—1984-85—Durg District	192
5.16	Release of grant from DRDA to blocks during 1984-85 and upto June 1985 in the blocks surveyed.	194
5.17	Allocation and actual expenditure from 1980-81 to 1984-85—Raipur District.	196
5.18	Allocation and expenditure from 1980-81 to 1984-85—Durg District.	196
6.1	Works Surveyed, Raipur and Durg Districts	197
6.2	Gram Panchayatwise profile of works under Panchayat Sector from 1980-81 to 1984-85—Dondi block—Durg District.	208

		Page
6.3	Works-wise expenditure under Panchayat Sector 1980-81 to 1984-85—Dondi block, Durg District.	223
6.4	Expenditurewise coverage of Gram Panchayats 1980-81 to 1984-85 Dondi block, Durg District.	224
6.5	Gram Panchayatwise distribution of works 1980-81 to 1984-85—Dondi block, Durg District.	225
6.6	Panchayatwise details of school works (more than one) 1980-81 to 1984-85 – Dondi block—Durg District	226
6.7	Month-wise disbursement of grant in Nagri, Mainpur and Balod blocks—1984-85.	229
6.8	Cases of Recovery.	229
6.9	Mandays estimated for school building as shown in Annual Action Plan, 1985-86.	230
6.10	Cost of materials in school building.	231
6.11	Mandays estimated in construction of school building.	231
6.12	Cost index in building works.	232
6.13	Statement showing task and rate for NREP works	233
6.14	List of revised rates	235
7.1	Details of cash and foodgrains distributed during 1984-85—Dondi block, Durg District	236
7.2	Payment of Wages	247
7.3	Allotment of foodgrains by DRDA during June 1985—Raipur District.	248
7.4	Centrewise allotment of foodgrains in Raipur District during June 1985	250

Page

7.5 Revised centrewise break-up of foodgrains allotment during June 1985—Raipur District 250

8.1 Caste composition of beneficiaries 251

8.2 Land-holding pattern of beneficiaries 252

8.3 Sex composition of beneficiaries 253

8.4 Employment provided to beneficiaries 254

ABBREVIATIONS

BDO	—	Block Development Officer
CSRE	—	Crash Scheme For Rural Employment
DDO	—	District Development Officer
DRDA	—	District Rural Development Agency
EGS	—	Employment Guarantee Scheme
FCI	—	Food Corporation of India
FFW	—	Food For Work
JRY	—	Jawahar Rozgar Yojna
NREP	—	National Rural Employment Programme
PIREP	—	Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Project
RES	—	Rural Engineering Service
RLEGP	—	Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme
RMP	—	Rural Manpower Programme
RWP	—	Rural Works Programme
SCs	—	Scheduled Castes
SDO	—	Sub-divisional Officer
STs	—	Scheduled Tribes
UT	—	Union Territory

CONTENTS

		Page
Foreword		v
Acknowledgements		vii
List of Tables		ix
Abbreviations		xiii
Introduction		1
	Section I	
1	Surplus Labour and Capital Formation	15
2	Review of Rural Employment Programmes	27
	Section II	
3	Objectives and Methodology	67
4	Administrative Set-up	70
5	Local Planning Process	76
6	Problems of Implementation	99
7	Distribution of Foodgrains	113
8	Impact of the Programme	122
9	Major Findings and Policy Implications	126
Annexure : Chart—Significant Aspects of Rural Employment Programmes		153
Tables		159
Bibliography		255
Index		269

INTRODUCTION

In India a considerable section of the rural poor consisting of landless labourers, marginal farmers and small farmers remains unemployed for a considerable period of time in a year. A number of programmes have been initiated from time to time for amelioration of the lot of the rural poor. Since the Third Plan, rural employment programmes on ad hoc basis were undertaken to provide employment as well as to develop infrastructural facilities in the villages. Probably, nowhere in the Third World countries, such programmes have been implemented on such a massive scale. From the Third to Seventh Plan India has experimented with a number of rural employment programmes. But the Sixth Plan marked a distinction. Since the Sixth Plan these programmes have come to constitute an important component of the anti-poverty strategy. The Seventh Plan accords a high priority to rural employment programme in its anti-poverty war.

A number of economists like Nurkse and Lewis advocated in the early 1950s on utilisation of surplus labour for purposes of capital formation in the underdeveloped countries. In India also social scientists like Dandekar, Rath, Chakravarty, etc., favoured adoption of wage employment programmes for capital formation. Besides centrally sponsored employment programmes, a number of state governments like Maharashtra, Gujarat, Kerala also experimented with such programmes. Out of these programmes, however, Employment Guarantee Scheme of Maharashtra is better known due to innovations made with regard to the raising of resources and in its execution.

In the Indian context, it looks that in the near future these programmes will continue to form a vital part of the national anti-poverty strategy. However, looking into the magnitude of the task and the problems of implementation

it will be helpful to look into the experience of implementing rural employment programmes.

The objectives of this study are:

- To understand the theoretical aspects of utilisation of surplus labour for capital formation.
- To review the rural employment programmes undertaken since the Third Plan.
- To oversee the implementation process in the National Rural Employment Programme.
- To ascertain how far is the policy outcomes consistent with the objectives.
- To find out principal reasons affecting the realization of the objectives.

PERSPECTIVE ON POLICY IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

Since, early 1960s in the developing countries, the failure to implement plans became a subject of major concern. It was Pt. Nehru who while addressing the Seventh Annual General Body Meeting of the Indian Institute of Public Administration on August 26, 1961 stressed for the first time, the role of implementation in the planning process. He said:

> We in the Planning Commission and others concerned have grown more experienced and more expert in planning. I fear we are not quite so expert at implementation as at planning....Now in this business of implementation, a very important factor is the administrative aspect;... the other aspect in implementation, in the vast plans that we have and which concern millions of people, is not a set of officials who implement them; you have to bring in a certain understanding of the public, a certain cooperation of the public. I think every administrator should realise this public aspect of any major undertaking. He must, wherever he may be working and whatever the project may be, whether he is the old type administrator or the new type of technical man, he has to create an atmos-

phere of understanding and appreciation in the public and win their cooperation.[1]

The problem of implementation in the plans of the developing countries has been analysed by Waterston in 1965. He observed:

> The gradual awakening to the realisation that plans do not implement themselves, and that specific measures must be adopted if plans are to be converted from expressions of aspiration to programme of action, has led to considerable discussion about what role the planner should play in implementation.[2]

He further articulated his views regarding the plan formulation and implementation:

> The failure of most planners to indicate precisely what must be done to execute their plans has tended to intensify the belief that the problems of plan formulation are different and separable from those of implementation.[3]

He also highlighted the importance of administration and politics in implementation of the plans:

> There can be little doubt that the prevailing separation of plan formulation from implementation has been exacerbated by the concentration of planners' attention on economic factors to the virtual exclusion of organisational and management factor which predominate when a plan is being implemented....in most less developed countries the greatest obstacles to implementation are administrative and, more especially, political rather than economic.[4]

[1]Quoted in *Jawaharlal Nehru and Public Administration*, New Delhi, Indian Institute of Public Administration, March 1975, pp. 97-98.

[2]A. Waterston, *Development Planning: Lessons of Experience*, Baltimore, John Hopkins Press, 1965, p. 335.

[3]*Ibid.*, p. 338.

[4]*Ibid.*, p. 339.

Regarding the necessity for political commitment Waterston commented:

> good administration and activity below depend heavily on firm and constant commitment of the political leadership above.[5]

The problem of plan implementation was highlighted more and more in the years to come:

> Of some 1,500 national development plans which have been prepared in the last twenty-five years, not many have been seriously implemented.[6]

Implementation was such a conspicuous gap in planning that Gunnar Myrdal coined the expression 'soft states' for the developing countries:

> The term 'soft state' is understood to comprise all the various types of social indiscipline which manifest themselves by : deficiencies in legislation and in particular law observance and enforcement, a widespread disobedience by public officials on various levels of rules and directives handed down to them, and often their collusion with powerful persons and groups of persons whose conduct they should regulate. Within the concept of the soft state belongs also corruption,...These several patterns of behaviour are interrelated in the sense that they permit or even provoke each other in circular causation having cumulative effects.[7]

[5]A. Waterston, p. 343.

[6]C.M. Martin, "Performance, Review and Evaluation : Their Roles in the Implementation of National Development Plans", (Paper prepared for the Conference of Asian Economic Planners, ECAFE, September, 1971) Quoted in U. Iglesian Garbriel, *Implementation: The Problem of Achieving Results: A Casebook on Asian Experience*, Manila, Eastern Regional Organisation for Public Administration, 1976, p. xvi.

[7]Gunnar Myrdal, *The Challenge of World Poverty : A World Anti-Poverty Programme Outline*, London, Penguin Books, 1971, p. 211.

As a consequence, some awareness of the critical role of public administration in the developmental process started getting recognised. In this connection, Rieger commented:

> The problems posed by implementation are far less glamorous than those of devising and manipulating sophisticated programming models. But advances in this bottleneck area may be far more useful for economic development than those achieved in programming techniques.[8]

Concern was also voiced elsewhere. Simultaneously in USA in the late 1960s and early 1970s impetus to the study of implementation came from the failures of the programmes established during the 'war on poverty' period. This resulted in a number of indepth case studies focusing on implementation of policies in the area of education, urban planning, civil rights, environmental quality and health services. It was pointed out by Levine that most of the trouble with the 'war on poverty' resulted: "not so much from the nature of the programmes as from difficulties of administration."[9]

As a result of the researches on policy implementation attention was also directed to conceptualise the implementation process. The earliest attempt in this direction was made by Bunker in 1970.[10] However, Smith's framework on policy implementation process makes an interesting distinction in the policies implemented in the Western countries and Third World. He observed:

> Generally, the Western bureaucracies are relatively efficient and effective in policy implementation...there is an

[8]H.C. Rieger, "Bureaucracy and the Implementation of Economic Plans in India", *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. XIII, No. 1, January-March 1967, pp. 33-34.

[9]R.A. Levine, "Rethinking Our Social Strategies", *Public Interest*, (Winter), 1968, pp. 86-96.

[10]D.R. Bunker, "Policy Sciences, Perspectives on Implementation Processes", *Policy Sciences*, No. 3, 1972, pp. 71-89.

implicit assumption in most models that once a policy has been 'made' by a government, the policy will be implemented and the desired results of the policy will be near those expected by the policymakers. This assumption rests upon certain political and organizational conditions. However, these conditions may not be found in all societies. Indeed, the societies of the Third World often are devoid of all or some of these conditions....The real role of interests groups and other interested groups, including political parties, comes when the policies are implemented by the government. It is at the implementation stage of the policy process when the policy may be abandoned by the government, implemented or modified to meet the demands of the interested parties. This process represents a radical departure from that found in many western nations. Interests and opposition in western societies focus upon the policymakers. If a policy is made (or not made) the various interests know that this decision will be implemented. And often there is little they can do about it at that stage. Research and theory building also has focused on the 'inputs' or upon the processes by which policies are made. However, in Third World nations the emphasis by interested parties is upon the policy itself or upon the bureaucrats who must implement the policy.[11]

However, this view was latter challenged and even abondoned, it was asserted that:

> The problems of implementation are profound in Western and non-Western nations alike: they are generic to complex organisations.[12]

As a result of the efforts, one perspective on policy

[11]T.B. Smith, "The Policy Implementation Process", *Policy Sciences*, 4, 1973, pp. 191, 198-99.

[12]D.S. Van Meter and C.E. Van Horn, "The Policy Implementation Process : A Conceptual Framework", *Administration and Society*, Vol. 13, No. 4, February 1975, p. 452.

implementation process put up by Van Meter[13] and Van Horn, Sabatier and Mazmanian[14] and Edward[15] is categorised as 'top down' approach:

> It tended to stress the need for a careful delineation of policy objectives into manageable and clearly defined elements, unambiguously assigned to administrative units which guaranteed the smooth passing on of public policy intentions into public policy effects.[16]

The variables of policy implementation framework provided by Van Horn and Van Meter includes:

— Policy standards and objectives;
— Policy resources (*i.e.*, funds or other incentives);
— Interorganizational communication and enforcement activities;
— Characteristics of implementing agencies, (*e.g.*, staff size, degree of hierarchical control, organizational vitality, etc.);
— Economic, social and political conditions, (*e.g.*, economic resources within the implementing jurisdiction, nature of public opinion, nature of interest group support, etc.); and
— Disposition of the implementors.[17]

The other important framework is provided by Sabatier and Mazmanian,[18] they identified three variables which effect policy implementation:

[13]D.S. Van Meter and C.E. Van Horn, pp. 445-488.

[14]P.A. Sabatier and Mazmanian, "Policy Implementation : A Framework of Analysis", *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 8, 1980, pp. 538-560.

[15]G.C. Edwards, *Implementing Public Policy*, Washington, DC, Congressional Quarterly Press, 1980.

[16]B. Wittrock and P. deLeon, "Policy as a Moving Target : A Call for Conceptual Realism", *Policy Studies Review*, Vol. 6, No. 1, August 1986, p. 47.

[17]D.S. Van Meter and C.E. Van Horn, *op. cit.*

[18]P.A. Sabatier and Mazmanian, *op. cit.*

— *Tractability of the Problem*: Availability of valid technical theory and technology, diversity of target group behaviour, target group as a percentage of the population, extent of behavioural change required;

— *Ability of Statute to Structure Implementation*: Clear and consistent objectives, incorporation of adequate causal theory, financial resources, hierarchical integration with and among implementing institutions. Decision-rules of implementing agencies, recruitment of implementing official, formal access by outsiders;

— *Nonstatutory Variables Affecting Implementation*: Socio-economic conditions and technology, media attention to the problem, public support, attitudes and resources of constituency groups, support from sovereigns, commitment and leadership skill of implementing officials.

The 'bottom-up' perspective, on the other hand, emphasized the discretion of the 'street level bureaucrats'. "It asserted that the factors which determine policy impact are outside the sphere of direct government control and have to do with transactions between public programmes and environments often dominated by private markets. Thus, implementation analysis must per force include an understanding of the structure of linkages between public and private sectors in the different 'bargaining arenas'. It also has to focus on those public institutions which are most proximate to crucial transactions and then trace the real workings of an implementation process from this bottom level upwards".[19]

Despite these developments "there is no one correct paradigm for implementation analysis".[20] In this study implementation is being understood as:

[19]B. Wittrock and P. deLeon, *op. cit*.

[20]P.A. Sabatier and D.A. Mazmanian, "Policy Implementation" in S.S. Negal and Marcell Dekker (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Policy Studies*, New York, 1983, p. 144.

> Policy implementation encompasses those actions by public and private individuals (or groups) that are directed at the achievement of objectives set forth in prior policy decisions. This includes both one-time efforts to transform decisions into operational terms, as well as continuing efforts to achieve the large and small change mandated by policy decisions.[21]

In the Indian context, Dantwala was the first to emphasise as early as in 1978, the importance of research on the "implementation performance of our development projects and programmes.[22] He further pointed out:

> The mechanics of implementation is even more important than the mechanics of plan formulation. However, good a plan may be, its impact will depend entirely on how well it is implemented. While there may be some disagreement on whether our plans have been well conceived or not, there is none whatsoever on the numerous imperfections, if not distortions, in their implementation. This is not surprising. While formulation of a good plan demands comprehension and technical competence on the part of a few men at the top, implementation encompasses a vast number of functionaries and agencies in a vast variety of fields and demands qualities on their part which are too numerous even to enumerate—leadership, dedication, aptitude for establishing rapport with the people and so on.[23]

The analysis of implementation of rural employment programmes is based on broad approaches mentioned above.

The present study is divided in two sections. Section I consists of two chapters. Chapter 1 provides a rationale of utilisation of surplus labour for capital formation. The Nurksian

[21]D.S. Van Meter and C.E. Van Horn, *op. cit.*, p. 447.

[22]Working Group on Block Level Planning, *Report*, (Chairman: Prof. M.L. Dantwala), New Delhi, Planning Commission, Government of India Press, 1978, p. 40-A.

[23]*Ibid*.

ing works, selection of labourers and payment of wages, technical supervision and durability. It also analyses issues in people's participation and information system. Chapter 7 deals with the problems in the distribution of foodgrains. It looks into the causes for non-distribution of foodgrains in time. Chapter 8 looks at the impact of the programme on the beneficiaries. Chapter 9 provides major findings of this study and also highlights certain basic issues having bearing on policy aspects.

SECTION I

1

SURPLUS LABOUR AND CAPITAL FORMATION

To a large extent, the rationale and even the basic framework for capital formation in labour surplus economies could be attributed to Ragnar Nurkse. His main concern is with "the vicious circle of poverty"[1] in which underdeveloped countries find themselves trapped. According to Nurkse, "A circular relationship exists on both sides of the problem of capital formation in the poverty-ridden areas of the world".[2] However, he is hopeful that though, "circular constellation of the stationary system is real enough, but fortunately the circle is not unbreakble. And once it is broken at any point, the very fact that the relation is circular tends to make for cumulative advance".[3] The Nurksian strategy mainly consists of developing, (underdeveloped countries) with surplus labour and scarce capital and in a way making the vicious circle of poverty beneficial rather than a liability in the developmental process.

In the Nurksian model of economic development a lot of emphasis is put on domestic sources of capital formation. His main contention is that over-populated peasant economies of the world suffer from large-scale underemployment in agriculture, implying that a large part of the population in agriculture could be transferred without significantly affecting the agricultural output. As such these economies suffer from large-scale disguised unemployment. The term disguised unemployment according to Nurkse, does not apply to wage labour. It is pointed out by Nurkse that due

[1]Ragnar Nurkse, *Problems of Capital Formation in Underdeveloped Countries*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1960, p. 4.

[2]*Ibid.*, p. 5.

[3]*Ibid.*, p. 11.

to lack of employment opportunities, between 66 per cent to 80 per cent of the total labour force work on the land and roughly 15 per cent to 30 per cent constitute disguised unemployment in such economies. In order to make surplus labour gainfully employed for capital formation, Nurkse suggested methods by taking the surplus people away from the land to work on producing real capital. In this manner, Nurkse suggested that disguised unemployment represents a concealed fund and the surplus population was a potential asset, by making them work on capital projects.

The originality of Nurksian idea regarding the use of surplus labour for capital formation consists in its financing. He was aware of the enormity of the problems involved in domestic mobilization of the resources. He was convinced that the mobilization of resources by means of taxation on the traditional as well as modern forms of conspicuous consumption—would be totally insufficient. He also considered foreign aid but did not put much emphasis on it due to its uncertainty and inadequacy. Nurkse suggested that it is possible to finance capital projects from the system itself. This could take place according to him if the productive peasants continue to feed the unproductive surplus labourers on capital projects.

Nurkse also discussed the possibility of leakages in the framework of capital formation. Firstly, these leakages could arise due to increased consumption of the productive labourers, secondly, those who are transferred to capital projects may consume more food than before, and thirdly, "through the cost of transporting the food from the farms to the places where the capital projects are established".[4] However, Nurkse was confident that theoretically in case of leakages arising out of increased consumption, it is possible to plug the deficit through "domestic saving, voluntary or involuntary".[5] Though in practice, Nurkse conceded that "it may be extremely difficult if not impossible to get the necessary complementary saving from domestic sources".[6] Nurkse

[4] Ragnar Nurkse, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

further added that leakage arising out of transfer of food could be reduced by establishing investment projects in rural areas. Although, Nurkse pointed out that in practice, this type of leakage is difficult to stop.

Nurkse further pointed out that the problem of financing this capital formation resolves into two parts, part one consists of providing them consumption goods which the system will provide, and secondly, the need for tools to work with. Nurkse also stressed the need that as far as possible labour intensive methods should be used in such projects. In fact, he had gone to the extent of saying that before the workers start working on their projects they should themselves make "most necessary primitive tools with their own hands".[7] He was not in favour of importing tools and machines from developed countries as they would be highly capital intensive and more suited for areas where there is scarcity of labour. By and large, he was against using of heavy equipment in capital investment projects. He further emphasised that "capital equipment imported into underdeveloped countries should be specially designed for the factor proportions prevailing in these countries".[8] In fact, he favoured "simpler tools and equipment may be appropriate to the relative factor endowment of countries of this type, in the early stages of industrial development".[9] He further strengthened argument for using simple tools by stating that in labour surplus economies there "exist underemployment not only of labour but also of capital".[10] He emphasised that if consolidation of holdings is carried out in such an economy, it would result in the release of these simple tools for use in the capital projects. He suggested the use of "local labour and local materials"[11] for capital investment projects.

Nurkse also gave attention to the types of capital projects which could be undertaken through surplus labour. He emphasised that such projects could be undertaken in

[7]Ragnar Nurkse, *op. cit.*, p. 44.
[8]*Ibid.*, p. 45.
[9]*Ibid.*
[10]*Ibid.*, p. 46.
[11]*Ibid.*

"agriculture as well as in manufacturing industry".[12] He also particularly favoured the launching of community development projects specially designed to make use of local labour surpluses or of seasonal slack periods in the countryside".[13] In such projects he included, "public utilities, transport facilities, training schemes, and various basic services".[14] He also thought of projects in "human skill, education and health".[15]

Nurkse discussed the question concerning the methods "by which the 'virtual' saving inherent in disguised unemployment is to be realized for capital formation".[16] He was aware of the complexity involved in forcing the peasant who are living close to subsistent level not to consume more of their produce. He suggested that "Taxation in kind may be attempted, or some form of requisitioning and controlled deliveries".[17] In this connection, he pointed out that, "problem of collecting the food seems to be solved in Soviet Russia by the system of collective farms. The word 'collective' has here a double meaning. The collective farm is not only a form of collective organization; it is above all an instrument of collection".[18] In fact, he was in favour of "some form of collective saving enforced by the state. . . for the mobilization of the saving potential implicit in disguised unemployment".[19] Nurkse categorically favoured that construction of these capital projects should be performed by private undertakings. The role of the state is limited to the extent of collection of food surplus.

INDIAN THINKING

The idea of using surplus labour for capital formation was favourably received by the Indian economists like Gadgil, Vakil, Brahmanand, Dandeker, Rath, Dantwala, Khusro,

[12]Ragnar Nurkse, *op. cit.*, p. 47.
[13]*Ibid.*
[14]*Ibid.*, p. 47.
[15]*Ibid.*
[16]*Ibid.*, p. 43.
[17]*Ibid.*
[18]*Ibid.*
[19]*Ibid.*

Chakravarty, etc. These economists have examined various aspects of using surplus labour for capital formation. However, they differ not only in the approach, but also in the finer details for using public works programme for capital formation. It is proposed to discuss the views of some of these economists on different aspects of public works programme.

Approach

Dandekar and Rath are primarily concerned with poverty and consider public works programme as a means of redistribution. According to them, assurance of the desirable minimum to everybody should be an objective of planned economic development.[20] As such, it is advocated by them that "the only feasible, and immediately available solution appears to be to offer and assure employment to all those who are willing to work on a minimum wage on works which can be immediately undertaken."[21] For this purpose, they pleaded:

> A large programme of rural works organised as a permanent feature for some years to come will also enable some of the agricultural proletariat to withdraw permanently from agriculture and thus help rationalise the existing employment in agriculture.[22]

The rationale for such type of works and the central role which such programmes can play in poverty alleviation is highlighted by Rath in the following words:

> The most meaningful way the bulk of the poor can be provided greater income to enable them to rise above poverty is greater opportunity of employment at least at the basic subsistence wage rate. Any one who is wanting employment at this wage rate and willing to put in the necessary amount of work, should be provided with opportunity to earn his income in this manner. In this

[20] V.M. Dandekar and N. Rath, *Poverty in India*, Pune, Indian School of Political Economy, 1971, p. 150.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

there is no demand on his entrepreneurial skills, no worry about repayment of a loan and no demoralising pursuit of a subsidy. Once large scale opportunity for greater earning through wage employment is created for the poor, this will create purchasing power for them and large market for the commodities produced in rural areas. Then the more able and enterprising amongst them will explore possibilities of bettering their lives by producing such and other products for the market, be this milk or meat, footwear or garments, shops or services of various kinds. A special programme for them will then be more productive, without the corrupting bait of large subsidy.[23]

Dandekar and Rath also pleaded "phasing out of the programme will be needed both for reasons of securing the needed financial resources and of setting up the necessary organisation and administration".[24] They pointed out, "the programme must be raised to a scale whereby one may honestly say that the country offers employment of a certain kind to every person who is willing to take it".[25]

Regarding the adoption of public works approach, it was felt by Chakravarty that "a redistribution of consumption within a given total may in certain situations lead to an increase in the level of capital formation".[26] However, Chakravarty perceives difficulties "connected with organisation which have been referred to quite often in this connection, there are certain important problems connected with mitigating the inflationary pressure that may be experienced in the short period if the strategy were to be adopted".[27] According to him, the main problem in adopting a strategy of rural public works "boils down to the distribution of benefits

[23]N. Rath, "Garibi Hatao: Can IRDP Do It?", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XX, No. 6, February 9, 1985, p. 245.

[24]V.M. Dandekar and N. Rath, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

[25]*Ibid.*

[26]S. Chakravarty, "Some Observations on Employment Oriented Planning", (Presidential Address to the XVI-XVII All India Labour Economics Conference), Waltair, Andhra University, December 27-29, 1974, p. 309.

[27]*Ibid.*

that will accrue from the creation of assets based on the non-market mode of labour organisation".[28]

Dantwala feels that "the entire development strategy should be based on labour intensive technology so that maximum labour absorption takes place through the regular development process, leaving a smaller backlog of unemployment for tackling through special employment projects".[29] He further mentions that: "a special or distinctive characteristic of these programmes, namely, their emphasis on employment generation, especially such as would not require 'skills of a high order' or to put it differently, as would utilise and in the process upgrade the traditional skills of the local community. But then a vast bulk of labour force in the country has only elementary skills and if employment of this component of our labour force is our concern, the entire development strategy will have to be geared to this purpose; special or supplementary programmes will not be adequate to meet the requirements of the situation".[30]

Labour Intensive Works

Dandekar and Rath favoured that such works should be labour intensive and the nature of the projects should be such "as would provide employment to a large number of unskilled workers".[31] According to them, "at least 75 per cent of the project expenditure should go into payment of wages to unskilled labour".[32] They also pleaded that the works programme must make a minimum use of material resources as cement, steel, etc. While it is observed by Dantwala that, "the insistence on 70 : 30 ratio of expenditure on wages and material precludes the undertaking of several worthwhile projects and/or adversely affects the durability and utility of the assets, such as, roads and, thus defeats the

[28]S. Chakravarty, *op. cit.*, p. 309.

[29]Review Committee on Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Project (PIREP), *Report*, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, Department of Rural Development, New Delhi, Government of India, August 1977, p. 67.

[30]*Ibid.*, p. 51

[31]V.M. Dandekar and N. Rath, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

[32]*Ibid.*

objective of creating productive assets. In view of this, the government has agreed to the relaxation of the ratio to 60 : 40, further conceding that individual works may have even a lower wage content provided that for all works taken together the non-wage component did not exceed 40. Thus, in the process of ensuring durability of the assets created, some sacrifice has been consciously made in respect of employment generation".[33] He observed "if further relaxation in wage-material ratio is conceded, the one justification of these programmes, namely, emphasis on employment generation will begin to fade. If, on the other hand, adherence to a substantial (and a rigid) wage component of the expenditure is insisted upon, there may be fewer and fewer eligible projects".[34] He pointed out "hence manual labour will be... only such as would enable the labour input to generate some productive assets".[35]

Selection of Projects

In the selection of projects, Dandekar, Rath and Dantwala hold identical views. According to them, in decision-making process regarding selection of the projects to be undertaken local organisations like Panchayat Samitis and Zila Parishad should be consulted. While Dandekar and Rath hold the view that "work must not be denied or delayed because somebody at these levels does not agree on the choice of works or their priorities",[36] Dantwala also observes about the limitation of consultation with the local bodies, "While the local people would undoubtedly reflect the felt needs, their understanding of the technical and economic feasibilities of their proposals is likely to be limited. There is also evidence to suggest that political and economic vested interests often apply undue pressures in decision-making. It is in this connection that the criterion as to who will benefit from the proposed works programme assumes importance".[37] Dantwala, however,

[33] PIREP, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
[34] *Ibid.*
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 70.
[36] V.M. Dandekar and N. Rath, *op. cit.*, p. 146.
[37] PIREP, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

observed that "an appropriate policy frame at the macro level is essential for the eradication of poverty and unemployment, meaningful planning exercise and an effective action programme have to be undertaken at a fairly decentralised level with the requisite devolution of authority and active participation of the disadvantaged groups".[38] He adds "an important desideratum of this strategy of tailoring employment generation to the needs and aptitudes of the people within the limits of the development potential of the area is a genuine commitment to the establishment of a competent planning authority and implementing machinery at the district or block level".[39]

Dandekar and Rath plead for massive projects of irrigation, afforestation, soil conservation, major road construction, etc. Rath has stressed that:

> Policies to generate greater rural employment cannot be confined to public sector programmes like NREP or EGS. There is scope for greater income and employment generation and its wider dissemination in the field of agriculture. Studies on large-scale irrigation projects in the plateau region of India, where water is the scarcest factor in agriculture, show that the present use of irrigation water is not generating the maximum net income per unit of water. If policy is changed to achieve this, irrigation water can reach many more acres, and many small farmers can increase their income in the process. In some of the eastern states, both flow and lift irrigation is characterised by poor use of water and very small generation of additional income. Policies appropriate to increasing intensity of cropping can greatly increase employment and income. Lift irrigation schemes are failing to deliver the goods due to widespread fragmentation. Policy measures to bring about consolidation can improve the prospect of greater employment in agriculture".[40] Rath further

[38]N.L Dantwala, "Rural Employment: Facts and Issues", *Economic and Political Weekly*, June 23, 1979, p. 1055.

[39]*Ibid.*, p. 1049.

[40]N. Rath , *op. cit.*, p. 245.

categorise public works for the predominantly poverty stricken regions of India which may be somewhat different than other regions.[41]

Dantwala favours projects which improve the productivity of agriculture, like land reclamation, land levelling, drainage, consolidation of holdings, proper distribution of irrigation water as well as works relating to village infrastructure. Chakravarty suggested that rural public works should include directly productive and infrastructural activities on an area basis. Insofar as directly productive activities are also brought into the orbit of operations, it may prove possible to apportion incremental benefits in a manner which combines requirements of equity with those of efficiency.[42]

Organisation of the Programme

Dantwala viewed public works programme in the nature of "seasonal, local and small and commensurate with financial resources and planning and implementation competence available locally".[43] Dandekar, on the other hand, favoured two types of organisation for public works programme:

> In one, the labour may be organised in labour cooperatives with a minimum number of 50 workers as the present law provides. Government should guarantee continued employment on contractual basis to all labour organised in labour cooperatives provided it is willing to move where work is. Possibly, all small and medium works can be executed through such labour cooperatives. The other form of labour organisation is what, in the First Five Year Plan, was referred to as the Land Army...the Land Army would execute them by employing the labour

[41]N. Rath, "Re-Orientation of the Rural Anti-Poverty Programmes: A Note in Thoughts on Rural Development", Proceedings of the Dialogical Session of the Seminar on *Poverty Alleviation—Policy Options*, New Delhi, August 26, 1985, Vol. II, Department of Rural Development, Ministry of Agriculture, New Delhi, 1985, p. 187.

[42]S. Chakravarty, "Mahalanobis and Contemporary Issues in Development Planning", *Sankhya*, Series C, 37, 1975, Pt. 2, p. 7.

[43]PIREP, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

as far as possible in the local area but moving it when necessary, wherever work is.[44]

Fiscal Measures

Regarding fiscal measures for public works, Chakravarty advocated a steeply progressive land tax[45] without which it is difficult to finance the projects. He also suggested, "appropriate modes of remuneration, which may take the form of partial ownership of the assets created by collective effort",[46] as other alternative for minimising the extra investment in these works.

Dandekar and Rath observed that "consumption of the rich will have to be firmly restricted for many years to come. Either the output of the luxury commodities will have to be restricted or it will have to be undertaken primarily for export".[47] Further, they mentioned that, "both direct and indirect taxation will have to be employed. The income-tax on non-agricultural income will have to be raised considerably ....Large agricultural income will have to be brought under corresponding taxation."[48] However, in this connection, "a major part of the additional requirements must be collected by indirect taxes on all luxury goods which go into the consumption of the richer classes".[49]

The utilisation of idle manpower for labour intensive public works was also recommended by a Group of experts of the United Nations as far as in the year 1951.[50] A large

[44]V.M. Dandekar, "Agriculture, Employment and Poverty", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXI, Nos. 48 and 49, (Review of Agriculture), September 20-27, 1986, p. A-100.

[45]S. Chakravarty, "Some Observations on Employment Oriented Planning", *op. cit.*, p. 310.

[46]*Ibid.*

[47]V.M. Dandekar and N. Rath, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

[48]*Ibid.*, p. 152.

[49]*Ibid.*

[50]United Nations, Department of Economic Affairs, *Measures for the Economic Development of Under-Developed Countries* (Report by a group of experts appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations), New York, May 1951, p. 56.

number of developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America since the late 1950s also adopted these programmes from time to time. These programmes were also used by the Chinese in the initial phase of their development.[51]

[51]T. Balogh, "Agricultural and Economic Development—Linked Public Works", *Oxford Economic Papers*, Vol. 13, No. 1, February 1961, pp. 34-35.

2

REVIEW OF RURAL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMMES

EVOLUTION OF THE POLICY

The genesis of rural employment programmes in India could be traced due to lack of employment opportunities for the bulk of the rural poor. The Second Agricultural Labour Enquiry 1956-57 revealed that the casual adult male agricultural worker and a female worker were not able to get employment for 128 days and 196 days respectively in a year. This prompted the government to utilise surplus rural manpower for capital formation. The National Development Council in April 1959, suggested organisation of supplementary works programme for harnessing the large manpower resources in the rural areas for rapid economic development, more specially in the following directions:

1. There should be legislation to enable panchayats to enforce customary obligations on the community or the beneficiaries, such as, maintenance of local irrigation works, maintenance and excavation of field channels, contour bunding, soil conservation works, etc.
2. The Third Plan should aim at the provision of certain minimum amenities for rural areas: (*a*) adequate supply of wholesome drinking water, (*b*) village schools, and (*c*) roads linking each village to the nearest main road or railway station. This should be secured through local development works schemes to which the people contribute. These will help generate necessary enthusiasm in rural areas.
3. Programmes for local development, especially for

agricultural production, should be drawn up and coordinated for villages and development blocks and should be linked with resources that could be mobilised locally, in addition to such resources, as are made available by the state governments.

4. It should be the objective of government policy and of day-to-day administration to assist the building up of community assets which would belong to the villages as a whole. The policies of state governments should, therefore, endeavour to facilitate the building up of community properties which would belong to the people as a whole such as village tanks, fisheries, plantations, grazing grounds, etc. Through grant of credit facilities, both on individual and community basis, special efforts should be made to strengthen the area of community operation in rural life.
5. All projects included in the Plan which call for the use of unskilled and semi-skilled labour should be carried out to the extent possible in each village and area by the community concerned, so that the employment provided and its benefits should accrue to the rural population. In areas, where there is a high incidence of unemployment, special works projects should be organised by the local authorities and the State Governments. In all these projects, wages at village rates may be paid and the possibility of paying a portion of the wages through savings certificates or other schemes of deferred payment should be explored.[1]

However, it was during the Third Five Year Plan that rural employment programme on a modest scale was initiated to provide employment to the rural manpower primarily during the lean seasons. This was a significant advance from the earlier thinking contained in the Second Five Year Plan which emphasised creation of additional employment in the traditional hand industries rather than on wage employment in development

[1]*Rural Works Programme*, Planning Commission, New Delhi, Government of India, February 1964, p. 14.

works.[2] The basic assumption in all such programmes has been better utilisation of unemployed or underemployed manpower in the rural areas till employment potential is augmented on a permanent basis over a period of years. These programmes are being continued since then in one form or the other. However, there is one very significant difference, the programmes initiated during Third, Fourth and Fifth Five Year Plans were primarily ad hoc in nature. It was only since the Sixth Five Year Plan that the rural works programmes have been given an important place in the overall strategy of poverty alleviation. Since the Third Plan, a number of programmes of rural works differing in objectives, criteria of financial allocations, planning of works, works to be taken up, involvement of labour cooperatives and panchayats, wage and material components, wages to be paid, mode of payment, etc., have been undertaken in India.

The Chart, given in the Annexure, provides an overview of the significant aspects of these programmes. In order to get better understanding of these approaches we shall try to compare them on some of the aspects mentioned in the Chart.

Objectives

In respect of objectives of these programmes, there have been five broad approaches:

— mobilisation of local initiative and resources (as in the RWP/RMP);
— full benefit to specific numbers or up to a specific value (as in the CSRE);
— full employment (as in the PIREP);
— additional gainful employment for the poorer section of the rural community (as in the FFW and the NREP);
— benefit to specific target groups for a specific period (as in the RLEGP).

[2]V.M. Dandekar and N. Rath, *Poverty in India*, Pune, Indian School of Political Economy, 1971, p. 123.

Selection of Areas

In terms of the selection of areas, by and large, in the RWP/RMP and the CSRE envisaged these programmes to be taken up in those areas where there is heavy pressure of population on land and incidence of unemloyment was high. In the PIREP the districts were selected by the Government of India and it was stressed that the selected blocks should cover a variety of agroclimatic conditions prevailing in different parts of the country. In case of FFW, NREP and RLEGP, the areas of operation of these programmes were all States/Union Territories. However, it was emphasised that in these programmes due weightage should be given to low wage pockets and where there is incidence of bonded labour.

Choice of Works

In connection with the works to be taken up under these programmes, the RWP/RMP, the CSRE and the PIREP, by and large, gave high priority to works which contribute to increased agricultural production. While the FFW and the NREP gave priority to durable productive community assets which strengthen the rural infrastructure. In the RLEGP it is emphasised to give priority to works relevant to 20-Point Programme and Minimum Needs Programme.

Criteria for Allocations

In the case of the CSRE, PIREP and the RLEGP, Central Government provided 100 per cent assistance; while FFW and NREP were both Centrally Sponsored Schemes on 50:50 sharing basis. It is important to mention that in the programmes like the NREP and the RLEGP emphasis was placed both in the allocations of central and state assistance to certain important criteria like incidence of poverty and number of agricultural labourers and marginal farmers. In earlier programmes like the CSRE and the PIREP, there was a tendency to give uniform allocation to district/block, later on this practice was discontinued.

Earmarking of Allocations

In the programmes like the RWP/RMP, the CSRE and the PIREP and to some extent in FFW, by and large, there was

no earmarking of allocations for works; while in the NREP and the RLEGP there have been clear directives to earmark allocations for social forestry, and works benefiting SCs and STs, etc.

Planning of Works

In the programmes like the RWP/RMP and the PIREP emphasis was placed on integrating the programme with the on-going developmental programmes. This emphasis continued in programmes like the NREP and the RLEGP. However, there was no emphasis in the earlier programmes like the RWP/RMP, the CSRE, the PIREP and the FFW to prepare detailed shelf of projects and annual action plans. In the NREP and the RLEGP, planning of works was given a lot of emphasis and detailed guidelines were issued for this purpose.

Wages

All these programmes prescribed a fix ratio of wage and material components. This ratio varied from programme to programme. The ratio was 60:40 (in the RWP/RMP), 75:25 (in the CSRE), 70:30 (in the PIREP) and 50:50 (in NREP and RLEGP). By and large, in the programmes like RWP/RMP, CSRE, and PIREP wages were paid at local slack season rates, while in the FFW, NREP and RLEGP wages were paid at the rate of prevailing minimum wages. Regarding mode of payment in the earlier programmes like the RWP/RMP, the CSRE and the PIREP payment was made fully in cash while in the FFW, the NREP and the RLEGP it has been both in kind and cash.

Involvement of Panchayats/Standards and Specifications Maintenance

The Panchayati Raj Institutions have been involved in the implementation of these programmes, except in the case of the PIREP and the RLEGP. Except in the RWP/RMP, no specific obligation was stipulated for community contribution in other programmes. The involvement of labour cooperatives in the implementation of rural works programmes was envisaged only in RWP/RMP, in other programmes no such conditions

were laid down. In the CSRE, the NREP and the RLEGP only it was maintained that the state governments should lay down the minimum technical standards and specifications for different types of work. However, there was no such directive in case of other programmes. Almost in all the programmes it was maintained that the state government would take the responsibility of the maintenance of the assets created.

AN ASSESSMENT

The rural employment programmes in one form or the other have remained a part of rural development since 1961-62. It is significant to note that by and large during the Third Five Year Plan and the Fourth Five Year Plan, the expenditure on these programmes was on a modest scale. These programmes were undertaken on an ad hoc basis up to the Fifth Five Year Plan. However, it was only during the Sixth Five Year Plan, these programmes have come to form a significant component in the anti-poverty strategy. In fact, there is growing awareness regarding the role which the rural employment programmes could play in the poverty alleviation. As a consequence of this, during the Sixth Five Year Plan another programme called the RLEGP was launched in August 1983 for providing wage employment to landless labourers. Despite the changes in the nomenclature of the programmes, the basic objectives, however, remained two-fold, *i.e.*, employment generation and creation of physical infrastuctural facilities. It is true that in the successive years emphasis was also laid on the durability of the physical assets, preference to the weaker sections in employment, payment of wages both in cash and kind, maintenance of assets and refinement in planning of works. An assessment is made below to systematically examine all these aspects from 1961-62 to 1986-87. Besides, analysis is also made of the modification in the guidelines and monitoring of these programmes. Table 2.1 provides expenditure incurred, employment generated and physical assets created during the above mentioned period.

Expenditure Incurred

It is evident from Table 2.1 that under various rural employment programmes undertaken from 1961-62 up to 1986-87, Rs. 5244.647 crore have been spent. The importance of these programmes can be further emphasized by the fact that increasing amount of resources are being placed under these programmes since the Sixth Five Year Plan. For example, during the Sixth Five Year Plan, an amount of Rs. 2,219 crore under the NREP and the RLEGP was incurred. However, it is interesting to note that during 1986-87, both under the NREP and the RLEGP the total amount incurred was Rs. 1,311.69 crore which was almost 50 per cent of the amount spent during the entire Sixth Five Year Plan period on these programmes.

Table 2.2 provides financial provision and expenditure incurred in rural employment programmes up to the Sixth Five Year Plan. It is evident that in the RWP the outlay was provided on a very limited scale. As a consequence, the programme had to be pruned. It resulted in non-realisation of the objectives and the targets. As a result, the impact on the employment situation had been correspondently limited. This is also true of the PIREP and the RLEGP. In the CSRE an outlay of Rs. 12.50 lakh was sanctioned for each district. This resulted in a very thin spread of the programme over a large area. As such it did not succeed in making any significant impact on the unemployment and underemployment situation in any area. But in the FFW and the NREP the percentage expenditure was more than the financial provision envisaged because a larger amount was made available in both these programmes.

Physical Assets

In almost all the rural employment programmes, by and large, generation of employment and creation of durable assets have been two main objectives. Table 2.1 provides the list of physical assets created up to 1986-87. This shows roads (11,60,666.77 kms.), minor irrigation (22,95,187.18 hec.), drainage (1,07,777.00 hec.), soil conservation (15,98,857.53 hec.), social forestry (11,14,256.42 hec.), tree planted

(1,54,18,60,000.00), schools (1,98,818.00), drinking water wells (98,104.00), houses for SCs and STs (2,25,201.00), works benefiting SCs and STs (2,14,000.00), rural sanitation works (60,893.00), etc. One common requirement in almost all the programmes has been creation of rural infrastructure on the basis of master plans. However, in the absence of such master plans and district plans in almost all the States/Union Territories, works under these programmes have been taken up in quite unplanned and haphazard manner. As a consequence, these programmes had limited impact on the rural, social, and economic infrastructure. Although, 11,60,666.77 kms. rural roads have been constructed, these works have been taken up in the most unsystematic manner. As a result of this we are nowhere near the target of an average of 2.5 km. of road length per village by the financial criteria adopted by the "Task Force on Projections of Minimum Needs and Effective Consumption Demand (1979)". By this criteria (on the basis of the total number of village 5,57,139 according to 1981 census) the total requirement would have been 13,92,847.50 km. By the above norm 4,51,282.59 villages (that is 81 per cent of the villages) should have been linked with fair weather roads by 1986-87. However, it has been pointed out that by the end of the Sixth Plan 30 per cent of the villages having a population of 1,500 and above and 50 per cent of the villages with a population of 1,000 to 1,500 have not been provided with such link roads. Similarly, in minor irrigation 22,95,187.18 hec. have been created but the actual increase in irrigated area is much less. In the case of school buildings 1,98,818.00* have been constructed within a period of last 10 years. The Fourth All India Educational Survey 1978-79 estimated that 1,90,000 villages are without schooling facilities.[3] It is very interesting and revealing that the National Education Policy 1986 pointed out, "considering the whole situation it would be correct to say that the number of habitations without

This figure does not include 79,000.00 School Building/ Panchayat Ghar constructed under these programmes as no bifurcation has been provided either of the assets created.

[3]Quoted in *National Policy on Education*, "Programme of Action", Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, New Delhi, Department of Education, November 1986, p. 12.

schools is still very large and that many of them are likely to be fairly large habitations. All state governments will ensure that all habitations with a population of 300 (200 in the case of tribal, hilly and desert areas) will be provided a primary school within the Seventh Plan".[4] If school buildings were constructed in a systematic and planned manner and in those areas which are having no schooling facilities than by this criteria this backlog would have been completed much before the end of the Sixth Plan.

Pattern of Sectoral Expenditure

An attempt has been made in Table 2.3 to provide pattern of sectoral expenditure in creation of various physical assets under different programmes for which the data are available. It is evident from the table that in all these programmes rural roads constituted a very significant item of expenditure. It is also important to mention that in the earlier programmes like the RWP and the CSRE and to some extent in the PIREP the expenditure was mainly on roads and productive schemes. However, in the NREP as well as in the RLEGP the pattern of expenditure is more on social and economic infrastructure. This point is more sharply highlighted in Table 2.4 which categorises the physical assets in three parts, directly productive, economic infrastructure and social infrastructure. This table shows that both in the NREP and the RLEGP the percentage of expenditure in comparison to earlier programmes is less on productive assets, and more on economic and social infrastructure.

Durability

The physical assets created so far as shown (Table 2.1) and pattern of sectoral expenditure (Table 2.3) and the pattern of sectoral expenditure categorywise (Table 2.4) do not throw light regarding the question of durability. It will be a folly to take the physical assets created without looking into the durability aspect. At the same time, the prospects of durability is closely related with other aspects, *viz.*,

[4]Quoted in *National Policy on Education*, "Programme of Action", *op. cit.*

wage and material components, preparation of master plans and the specifications and standards of works. In the CSRE it was reported that "in most of the States, the road works were for construction or improvement to kuccha specifications mostly without metal soling or surfacing. Even where the state governments intended to build pucca roads eventually expenditure till the end of 1972-73 or later had mostly been on earth work. It was seen that much of the earth work had not been compacted nor was cross drainage provided. As for not taking up construction of pucca roads in the rural areas, the Department of Rural Development had contended that it was not possible to take up construction of pucca roads straight way as the earth work could only be done in the first year and only after the earth had settled down by one or two good monsoon seasons, the soling and metalling could be done during the second or third year. The Chief Engineer (Planning), Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Roads Wing) denied Department of Rural Development's contention and has stated during evidence that the earth work and compaction should be done simultaneously, preferably with a mechanical road rollar. According to him, rainfall gives neither adequate nor uniform compaction, besides it erodes loose earth. The Committee is surprised that before starting construction of roads, the Department took no action whatsoever to lay down the specifications of roads in consultation with the Roads Wing. The result is that there has been large scale construction of sub-standard roads as has been pointed out by the officers of the Central Government touring the various states.[5] Besides a large number of roads were left unfinished. In several states on the termination of the CSRE, "the total length of such unfinished roads was 23,032 kms., completion of which required more than Rs. 59 crore. Further, states like Andhra Pradesh and Bihar which had already invested a major portion of the allocations under the crash scheme on the roads, are among the states which have left the largest number

[5] Public Accounts Committee 1974-75, *Crash Scheme on Rural Employment*, Hundred and Seventieth Report, Fifth Lok Sabha, New Delhi, Lok Sabha Secretariat, April 1975, pp. 46-47.

of roads unfinished on March 31, 1971. This is indicative of the fact that projects, particularly the roads, had been taken up in haphazard manner without any relationship to funds available under the scheme. The Committee can only reiterate their concern that "these roads have been left at a stage at which the chances of their resulting in total infructuous expenditure are very great".[6] Regarding the roads constructed in the FFW, it was pointed out that "many of the roads were not provided with the top soling as per the standards laid down for the purpose and also has no culverts and bridges and hence could not be considered durable community assets as defined in the guidelines".[7]

One of the basic objectives of the FFW was to establish durable community assets. However, it was revealed that as much as 46 per cent works undertaken were non-durable.[8] Out of this, construction and repair of village roads, streets and drainage scheme accounted for the maximum number of non-durable works. It was also observed that "no data is available with the ministry, as to the value of such non-durable assets."[9] This was a consequence of the fact that "while foodgrains were supplied by the Centre, adequate funds were not made available by the state governments

[6]Public Accounts Committee 1976-77, *Crash Scheme on Rural Employment*, Two Hundred and Twenty Eight Report, Fifth Lok Sabha, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, Department of Rural Development [Action taken by the Government on the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee contained in their 170th Report. (Fifth Lok Sabha)], New Delhi, Lok Sabha Secretariat, August 1976, pp. 19-20.

[7]Public Accounts Committee 1981-82, *Food for Work Programme*, Ninetieth Report, Seventh Lok Sabha, Ministry of Rural Development, New Delhi, Lok Sabha Secretariat, March 1982, p. 14.

[8]Planning Commission, Programme Evaluation Organisation, *Evaluation of Food For Work Programme*, August-October, 1979, Final Report, New Delhi, Planning Commission, November 1980, p. 36.

[9]Public Accounts Committee 1983-84, *Food for Work Programme*, Hundred and Seventy Third Report, Seventh Lok Sabha, Ministry of Rural Development (Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee contained in their 19th Report (Seventh Lok Sabha) New Delhi, Lok Sabha Secretariat, September 1983, p. 7.

for the material component, *viz*., cement, bricks, steel, etc., as well as skilled labour, technical supervision, etc".[10] It was observed that this was the result of the projects which were taken by the states in a casual manner without identifying the basic needs and the priorities of the village community.[11] However, non-durable assets created under the FFW programme, the Central Government provided Rs. 105 crore out of the plan outlay at the end of 1980-81 to various states/UTs for converting them into durable works.[12] It was further observed: "though in connection with the FFW programme the Public Accounts Committee had directed that all the non-durable works should be made durable under a time-bound programme. The Ministry was not even aware (July 1984) whether any, and if so, which of the non-durable assets created in the past had actually been converted into durable ones with the help of the specific grant of Rs. 105 crore provided by it in 1980-81. The details were reported to be not forthcoming from the States. The unutilised amount out of Rs. 105 crore was merged with the regular funds of NREP in subsequent years. Even in respect of assets created from 1980-81 onwards, there was no break-up of durable and non-durable assets, nor could it be confirmed that all the assets created were durable ones."[13] In the NREP, it was reported that "the total value of assets created under all types of schemes during 1981-82, about 88 per cent was reported as that of durable assets and the remaining 12 per cent as that of non-durable assets. During 1982-83, however the share of non-durable assets in the total value of assets increased to about 20 per cent".[14] It has also been observed that during 1980-81 to 1983-84 under the NREP, non-durable assets were created on expenditure of more than Rs. 65.67 crore. Most of these non-durable assets

[10]Public Accounts Committee 1983-84, *op. cit*., p. 6.
[11]Public Accounts Committee 1981-82, *op. cit*., p. 45.
[12]*Report 1983-84*, Comptroller and Auditor General, Union Government (Civil), New Delhi, Controller of Publications, 1985, p. 38.
[13]*Ibid*., pp. 38-39.
[14]Planning Commission, Programme Evaluation Organisation, *Evaluation Report on National Rural Employment Programme (NREP)*, New Delhi, Planning Commission, March 1987, p. 137.

were Kuccha road works.[15] This, despite the fact that in order to ensure the durability of assets, a provision was made for expenditure on materials to the extent of 40 per cent of the total project cost (revised to 50 per cent in 1983-84).

Employment Generation: Unrealistic Targets

It is evident from Table 2.5 that in the RWP achievement of employment generation was 23 per cent only. This was due to the allocation of limited outlay on the programme, which was 13 per cent of the total outlay envisaged in the Third Plan (See Table 2.2). However, in the CSRE actual achievement slightly exceeded the target, in spite of the fact that the outlay was reduced to Rs. 15.57 crore (see Table 2.2) as in this programme cent per cent of works undertaken were earth works like land development, irrigation, soil conservation, Kuccha roads, afforestation, village tanks, etc. In the FFW as against the targets there was 61 per cent achievement. As such, there was a shortfall of nearly 39 per cent in the generation of additional employment during the entire operation of the FFW programme. The anticipated generation of additional employment was calculated on the basis of 2.5 kg. of foodgrains per head per day. This could not be achieved as most of the state governments paid entire wages in foodgrains, as they could not find enough funds from their own resources. Although the state governments were never instructed to distribute foodgrains as wages at the rate of 2.5 kg. per head per day.[16] In the NREP during the Sixth Plan period it was envisaged to generate 15,000 to 20,000 lakh mandays. The total outlay earmarked for this programme during the Sixth Plan constituted both 'material' and 'wage' components. It has been observed that "with this wage outlay, the contemplated number of mandays could be achieved only if the wage rates ranged between Rs. 4.90 and Rs. 6.54 per manday. The minimum agricultural wage rates payable to unskilled workers were already higher than those in several states, and there were further increases in most of the states/Union Territories affecting, *inter alia*, the states (number-

[15]CAG, *Report 1983-84*, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-40.
[16]Public Accounts Committee 1983-84, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

ing ten) accounting for 88 to 91 per cent of the all-India targets of the programme. The rates for the skilled workers were still higher. The contemplated targets of work generation could not, thus, be expected to be achieved. An analysis of the expenditure on wages, *vis-a-vis*, the number of mandays reportedly generated revealed the per capita wage rate of Rs. 5.63 (1981-82), Rs. 7.46 (1982-83) and Rs. 8.06 (1983-84)".[17] It was also observed that in some States "reports furnished to the state headquarters/Central Government were not factual but highly exaggerated".[18] It was mentioned that a number of state governments devised different formulae to compute the generation of mandays. For example, "Tamil Nadu Government had instructed (November 1982) to compute the generation of mandays by dividing the expenditure on wages by Rs. seven per manday in disregard of the fact that wage rates for the skilled workers employed were as high as Rs. 21.50 per diem. Till November 1982, even the material component (generally 40 per cent of the total) was not excluded while computing the number of mandays. In the districts/blocks test-checked in Madhya Pradesh, Nagaland, Orissa and Punjab, the number of mandays reported as generated had been computed by dividing the expenditure on wages by the minimum wage rate".[19] In the RLEGP the achievement of employment generation was 73 per cent during the Sixth Plan. It has been pointed out that this shortfall was primarily due to the fact "the programme was launched in the latter half of 1983-84 and the necessary arrangements for its implementation had to be made, the programme was slow to take off".[20]

Employment for Short Durations

In all the rural employment programmes so far undertaken, the duration of employment per participating household was for short periods. In the RWP as against the target of providing employment for 100 days, it was reported that on an

[17]CAG, *Report 1983-84*, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

[18]*Ibid.*

[19]*Ibid* p. 36,

[20]*Annual Report 1985-86*, Ministry of Agriculture, New Delhi, Department of Rural Development, p. 26.

average employment on the project was provided for 33 days during July 1961 to April 1962, 32 days during 1963. During 1962 this average was still lower, *i.e.*, 17 days.[21] In the CSRE, it was reported that the average number of mandays employed per participating household was 101.6 mandays in a year [22] In the FFW the overall average increase in employment amounted to 44 days per participating household.[23] In the NREP the average employment per participating household during 1982-83 was about 69 mandays.[24] However, it was pointed out that the employment was not provided on a sustained basis. It was reported that "during test-check in Gujarat... that the employment provided was for a very short duration in a year and was not adequate even for the lean periods of agricultural operations. The average number of mandays generated per year/per head was 18 in Ahmedabad district during 1981-84 and 17 mandays in Kheda district during 1981-83. In Rajasthan, 70 panchayats test checked did not provide any employment or provided it for short periods up to only a maximum of six months".[25] While in case of the RLEGP it has been pointed out that one of the objectives of the programme to provide guarantee of employment to at least one member of every rural landless household up to 100 days in a year, could not be operationalised for the period during 1983-85.[26]

Unit Cost of Employment

The average unit cost of generating employment since the Third Plan has been given in Table 2.6. The average unit cost of employment in the RWP was Rs. 2.34 and in the NREP (1986-87) and the RLEGP (1986-87) it was Rs. 17.40 and

[21]Planning Commission, Programme Evaluation Organisation, *Report on Evaluation of Rural Manpower Projects*, New Delhi, Planning Commission, 1967, p. 32.

[22]Planning Commission, Programme Evaluation Organisation, *Study of Crash Scheme for Rural Employment 1971-74*, New Delhi, Planning Commission, 1979, p. 22.

[23]*Evaluation of Food for Work Programme*, August-October 1979, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

[24]*Evaluation Report on NREP*, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

[25]CAG, *Report 1983-84*, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

[26]*Annual Report 1985-86*, *op. cit.*, 1986, p. 26.

Rs. 20.71 respectively. The table indicates that the cost of employment per manday has been increasing since the inception of the RWP. It is important to mention that variations in the extent of employment generated by different programmes and by each scheme in different areas are influenced by factors like wage content of the scheme, the nature of work involved, the proportion of expenditure on materials and the difference in the wage rates.

Labour Cooperatives and Registration of Workers

Organisation of labour cooperatives and execution of works requiring unskilled labour through such cooperative was one of the key aspects of the RWP. However, it was observed that "no such cooperatives were organised and in some areas even if the cooperatives were either in existence or were specially organised under the manpower projects no work was done through them".[27] Some of the reasons reported were "existence of petty contractors, problem of getting efficient, educated and devoted secretaries, difficulty in collection of share capital and working capital, dispersal of labour over a large area and lack of the mobility, lack of interest on the part of panchayats, and the block agency in organising these societies".[28] It was also observed that "no need was felt for organising labour cooperatives in some areas; and in some others it was asserted that no purpose was likely to be served by these institutions".[29] In fact, certain questions were raised as to their role in the RWP, "How far is it feasible to organise dispersed labourers for work mainly in slack season ? Will it be possible to sustain labour cooperatives unless there are regular schemes of work and guarantee of continuous employment? What is their exact role, *vis-a-vis*, the panchayats which now, through their 'nominees', mobilise and supervise labour and some of whom are reluctant to hand over this job to labour cooperatives ?"[30]

In the PIREP, it was noted that "in a number of blocks the number of persons registered was less than the number of

[27]*Report on Evaluation of Rural Manpower Projects, op. cit.*, p. 10.
[28]*Ibid.*
[29]*Ibid.*
[30]*Ibid.*

persons listed as per the unemployment surveys".[31] It was mentioned that the following factors were responsible for the difference: (1) availability of adequate work on the farm; (2) inadequate wages under PIREP; (3) too young or too old or otherwise incapacitated; (4) long distance to project sites; (5) unsuitability of nature of work; (6) lack of knowledge of registration; (7) domestic constraints; (8) lack of knowledge in regard to employment under the project; and (9) loss of one day's wages involved in getting oneself registered.[32] It was further observed that "Registration of willing persons was said to have suffered due to immigration of workers from the neighbouring drought stricken areas, change in the attitude of people who had earlier expressed their willingness, workers finding the PIREP works less advantageous than their traditional sources of employment, the gradual penetration of "labour contractors" and due to the lack of genuine hard work by the junior engineers at the work spots".[33]

In the FFW, it was observed that the method of registration of labourers for employment was found only in five districts and in the remaining 15 districts, no specific method of registration for selection of workers was followed.[34]

In the NREP only 15 per cent labourer registered themselves for employment on works and in two states, namely, Karnataka and Tripura the system of registration was reported to be in existence.[35]

Participation by Different Groups

In the RWP during 1961-63, it was found that half of the selected labourers belonged to SCs and STs and during 1964 the percentage was 41.[36] In the CSRE, "Of all the

[31] *Report of the Review Committee on Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Project (PIREP)*, New Delhi, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, Department of Rural Development, August 1977, p. 28.

[32] *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29.

[33] *Ibid.*

[34] *Evaluation of Food for Work Programme*, August-October 1979, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

[35] *Evaluation Report on NREP*, March 1987, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

[36] *Report on Evaluation of Rural Manpower Project, op. cit.*, p. 18.

categories of rural population, the participation of marginal farmers was lowest, being only 34 per cent of the total participating households. Possibly, this was because of their preoccupation with operations on land. As between the agricultural and non-agricultural labourers, the proportion of the former was higher at 47.6 per cent. As between the SCs, STs and others, the maximum participation 75.6 per cent was in the case of scheduled tribes, in respect of this group the persons employed per household were as large as 2.2, also the mandays employed per participant household was the highest at 17.5. In 11 out of 27 districts, there was no female participation at all. In five more districts, the female participation was marginal, *i.e.*, less than 10 days of work per household".[37] In the FFW, "Out of the total beneficiaries, 50.6 per cent were agricultural labourers, 22.4 per cent cultivators 19.7 per cent non-agricultural labourers and 7.3 per cent others. Of the total beneficiaries 42 per cent were Scheduled Castes, 13 per cent Scheduled Tribes and 45 per cent others. Eighty per cent of the selected persons engaged in the FFW programme were males and 20 per cent females".[38] In the NREP it has been reported that "Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Backward Class beneficiaries taken together constitute about 70 per cent of the total sample beneficiaries and shared 80 per cent of the total employment under NREP during 1982-83 with an average of 79 mandays of employment per family on NREP works. As against this 294 out of 984 beneficiary households or 30 per cent belonged to other social groups and shared only 20 per cent of the total employment during 1982-83 with an average of 46 mandays of employment per family".[39]

Planning of Works

It was observed in the case of the RWP that due consideration was not given to criteria like high incidence of unemloyment during slack period, high density of population, rela-

[37] *Study of Crash Scheme for Rural Employment, 1971-74, op. cit.*, p. vi.

[38] *Evaluation of Food for Work Programme*, August-October 1979, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

[39] *Evaluation Report on NREP*, March 1987, *op. cit.*, pp. 168-69.

tively low agricultural productivity and inadequate employment potential in selecting the areas to be covered by the scheme.[40] It was reported in some cases the block officials were not clear about the basis of the selection of a particular block for this purpose. It was further pointed out that the state governments "did not have sufficient time to make the selection of areas as per the criteria stipulated by the Planning Commission".[41] Besides, the state governments "did not have the relevant data readily available".[42] Generally, such blocks were selected which had "some works schemes already prepared in some other connection, or where such schemes could be readily formulated".[43] As a consequence, employment needs and availability of labour, etc., could not be assessed in most of the blocks.[44] It was observed that in the selection of the schemes many works were found to be non-productive type and as such they did not fulfil one of the objectives of the programme of developing the production potential of the area. It was reported that in some States, "schemes were selected without any serious examination of the problems, bottlenecks and possibilities of their implementation".[45] As a consequence, "the schemes ran into the problems of shortage of technical and trained personnel, inadequate administrative experience and rising costs".[46] It was envisaged that those schemes should be included in the RWP which have high wage content and minimum expenditure on equipment and materials.[47] However, it was reported that "cost of materials and the survey of work was relatively high and not more than the 50 per cent of the funds allocated could be used for wage payment".[48] Broadly speaking in the planning of the RWP no regular survey of unemployment and underemployment was undertaken. As a result, the timing aspect

[40] *Report on Evaluation of Rural Manpower Project, op. cit.*, p. 3.
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 4.
[42] *Ibid.*
[43] *Ibid.*
[44] *Ibid.*
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[46] *Ibid.*, p. 3.
[47] *Ibid.*
[48] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

of work execution was not given due consideration. As stipulated in the programme no master plan of works covering comprehensive developmental aspects were drawn.[49]

In the planning of the CSRE works, it was pointed out that the time given to the states for the preparation of viable projects was rather short. A large number of works were undertaken "which in many cases were not even surveyed in advance"[50] It was observed, "The speed intended in the programme did not perhaps permit deliberate planning and pre-preparation in the absence of blue-prints of projects in advance with the State Governments".[51] It was reported that "out of the 53 selected works investigated, no estimates were prepared in respect of 28 per cent of works. In respect of roads, of the selected works, no estimates were prepared for as many as 41 per cent of these works. Furthermore, it appeared that the estimates of the labour potential of the work were not correctly worked out in respect of 60 per cent of the cases. In 31 out of 53 works, employment generation was more than (+) 20 per cent of the estimated value".[52] One of the objectives of the programme was to provide employment during slack seasons. It was stipulated that an average size of expenditure on work should be between Rs. 22,500 to Rs. 25,000. On this basis, an average expenditure on the work should be Rs. 6,000 per month. However, "From this yardstick, a large number of selected works fell much below the 'norm' in each of the categories of projects. The only works to satisfy this norm were the large projects such as widening and deepening of fish ponds, repair of flood channels and drains, remodelling of drains, construction of irrigation tanks, etc., but even regard to them, there were cases where, despite a large size, the average value of task performed per month was observed to be very small or below the norm. Perhaps one reason for such a situation was the over-stretched period of execution,

[49] *Report on Evaluation of Rural Manpower Project, op. cit.*, p. 32.

[50] *Study of CSRE, 1971-74, op. cit.*, p. 5.

[51] *Ibid.*

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

resulting in expenditure below per month average norms".[53] It was mentioned that the size of a project ordinarily be such that it would employ a minimum of 50 persons continuously for 15 weeks. However, this norm was achieved in 17 per cent of the districts only.[54] It was further pointed out that "It would imply that in cases where specified norm was attained, one or more of the expected features of the execution of works would have been sacrified, for example, in the administrative viability, durability, or impact on the augmentation of income of the labourers. However, the mere fact that the norm was fulfilled in terms of average prize of the work taken up in each category should not carry the implication that the execution of works was done in a cogent, continuous and discrete fashion, for the length of period over which such work was executed and completed would also have to be seen and assessed".[55]

In the planning of the PIREP it was stipulated that three aspects: (*i*) conducting unemployment surveys ; (*ii*) preparation of employment budget; and (*iii*) registration of works would be given due consideration. A number of shortcomings were noticed in the conduct of unemployment surveys. The officials entrusted to carry out the surveys "did not properly understand the concepts and definitions",[56] and other details and as a consequence of this "such data could not be relied upon".[57] Secondly, the reliability of data was doubtful due to the "attitude of the respondents"[58] because the respondents "did not give honest answers to the surveyors".[59] In the PIREP it was envisaged that the number of unemployed persons in a block would be about 2,800 out of which one-third was to be provided employment during the first year, two-third in the second year and all the workers in the third year of implementation of the project. It was observed that number of persons requiring employment was much higher than anti-

[54]*Study of CSRE 1971-72, op. cit.*, p. 18.
[55]*Ibid.*, p. 18.
[56]*Report of the Review Committee on PIREP, op. cit.*, p. 20.
[57]*Ibid.*
[58]*Ibid.*, p. 21.
[59]*Ibid.*

cipated in the programme objectives.[60] It was not found possible to provide funds on this scale. The funds provided were much less and consequently the employment generated was also much smaller than the requirements as indicated by the unemployment surveys. Even if the funds were provided on the scale required, it is doubtful whether full utilisation could have been effected in view of the administrative and technical problems involved.[61] Most of the states did not prepare work projects as envisaged in the guidelines and projects were formulated and implemented on a year to year basis.[62] It was pointed out that "some State governments did not fully realise the significance of this action-cum-research project. They appear to have treated the work projects under PIREP as an additional work programme".[63] It was observed that "in a number of blocks the number of persons registered was less than the number of persons listed as per the unemployment surveys".[64] It was further observed that "Most of the new works were taken up on the basis of pressures, political as well as others, rather than on judicious justification".[65] Besides, the "productivity of works had not been given adequate emphasis in selection of works".[66] An important requirement of planning of the PIREP project was its integration with the block plan or sectoral master plans of the district. It was observed that: "in most of the blocks/districts there were no master plans nor was an attempt being made by the project Officers appointed under the PIREP to formulate master plans for the blocks. Work projects were selected taking into consideration the felt needs of the local people. The felt local needs may not always represent the most important needs of the area on which expenditure need to be incurred. The selection of the projects might be made due to the pressures exercised by the influential people in the local area and the execution of such projects would bring

[60] *Report of the Review Committee on PIREP*, *op. cit*., pp. 26-27.
[61] *Ibid*., p. 27.
[62] *Ibid*.
[63] *Ibid*., p. 28.
[64] *Ibid*.
[65] *Ibid*., p. 38.
[66] *Ibid*.

in benefits to the limited number of people".[67] It was further reported, "The project authorities generally undertook works which were technically least complex and administratively easiest to implement. Their choices proved to be suboptimal."[68] It was observed that "To select a project and then get it examined from the point of its technical and financial viability is quite different from selecting the project which fits best with the overall objective of promoting self-sustaining growth of income and employment in the project areas. Besides, much more than mere subject-matter specialisation is necessary for appraising the appropriateness of development programmes for the weaker section. Further, a subject matter specialist is not necessarily competent to advise on the type of integrated development programme of which the special employment programme must form a part—the policy makers have in view. Particularly what we have in mind is the problem of forward and backward linkages of the various programmes, which when fully mapped out would constitute a meaningful development plan".[69]

Regarding the planning of schemes under FFW, it was observed "the Food for Work Programme was initiated without carrying out any specific survey with regard to the scale and magnitude of rural unemployment/underemployment".[70] Further "no efforts were made to draw up a shelf of projects based on the needs of the rural community after carrying out detailed field surveys and collecting the requisite data. Since these schemes were meant for the rural poor it was also necessary that those who were to be the beneficiaries of the scheme were chosen in a more careful manner".[71]

Regarding planning and formulation of projects in the NREP, it was observed that, "In Madhya Pradesh (up to 1982-83), Meghalaya, Nagaland, Orissa and Goa, Daman and Diu (1982-84), no shelf of projects had been prepared in any district. In Arunachal Pradesh, no shelf/annual action plan was prepared up to 1981-82. In Himachal Pradesh, West Bengal and Madhya

67 *Report of the Review Committee on PIREP*, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-42.
68 *Ibid.*, p. 60.
69 *Ibid.*
70 Public Accounts Committee, 1981-82, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
71 *Ibid.*

Pradesh, annual action plans had not been prepared for 1980-81 and 1981-82. In Bihar, Haryana, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and Pondicherry, these plans had not been prepared generally in the case of districts/blocks test checked".[72] It was observed, "that none of the concerned state governments had accorded any particular priority to the following types of work though specifically recommended in the guidelines: (*i*) works which are needed to be taken up in those areas which have predominant population of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, and of landless labourers; (*ii*) Works in those pockets in respect of which persistent complaints are received about the existence of concealed bonded labour ; (*iii*) Works in areas which are identified as low wage pockets ; and (*iv*) Works benefiting women".[73] In some States the schemes undertaken in social forestry "were found to include the growing of nurseries for distribution of saplings to all farmers, big and small and in other small village lots, etc., without any adherence to cost of physical norms. Apart from an attempt to substitute funds, this indicates a situation in which there may not be much potential for long-term income or employment effects, particularly for the target group, apart from the fact that in the process the concepts of social forestry itself has tended to get relegated to a level of marginal relevance".[74]

It was pointed out in the RLEGP that "planning and preparation of shelf of projects on the basis of the area approach is not done".[75] One of the objectives of the programme is to provide guarantee of employment to at least one member of every rural landless household up to 100 days a year. This could not be operationalised.[76] As a consequence, it has not been "possible to assess as to what extent continuous employment

[72]CAG, *Report 1983-84*, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

[73]*Evaluation Report on NREP*, March 1987, *op. cit.*, p. 161

[74]Madhukar Gupta, "Employment Programmes Need Prope Direction", *Yojana*, February 16-28, 1985, p. 8.

[75]*Annual Report*, *1986-87*, New Delhi, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, 1987, p. 27; and Planning Commission, "Mid-Term Appraisal", *Seventh Five Year Plan*, *1985-90*, New Delhi, Planning Commission, 1988, p. 42.

[76]*Annual Report 1985-86*, 1986, *op. cit.*, p. 26; and "Mid-Term Appraisal," *Seventh Five Year Plan 1985-90*, 1988, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

is being provided under the programme to the rural population".[77] Besides, it is expected from this programme to have resulted in creation of durable community assets and economic infrastructure in the rural areas. However, it was pointed out that "a tendency to concentrate on assets creation on the basis of departmental plans rather than on the basis of the requirements determined locally and of the need to provide the requisite quantum of employment to the landless labourers, has been noticed. "Concentration on road projects was also initially observed which was later sought to be restricted to not more than 50 per cent of the total outlays and also confined to the priorities arising out of the Minimum Needs Programme".[78] Regarding social forestry works, it is observed in RLEGP that the following factors are hinderances in the planning of such works:

(*i*) Planning, project formulation and implementation of projects require technical expertise which was not available up to the required level, so far;
(*ii*) Development and adoption of workable models of plantation took time; and
(*iii*) Development of proper attitudes in favour of social forestry required time and training.[79]

Income

The earnings of each participating household in the CSRE amounted to Rs. 304 per year.[80] Additional income generated in the FFW programme varied from Rs. 23 to Rs. 1,569 during 1978-79 per selected household.[81] However, in the FFW, it was observed that the generation of additional income was only "short term and seasonal in nature and did not provide them a continuous and permanent income stream".[82] It was repor-

[77] *Annual Report 1985-86, op. cit.*, p. 26.
[78] Planning Commission, *Seventh Five Year Plan*, *1985-90*, Vol. II, New Delhi, Planning Commission, October 1985, p. 60.
[79] *Annual Report 1986-87, op. cit.*, p. 26.
[80] *Study of CSRE 1971-74, op. cit.*, p. 22.
[81] *Evaluation of Food for Work Programme*, August-October 1979, *op. cit.*, p. 47.
[82] *Ibid.*

ted that Rs. 741 per participating household represented wage income from employment on the NREP works during 1982-83.[83]

Payment of Wages

In RWP, in majority of the cases it was found that mode of payment was piece-rates and payments were reported to be regular.[84] In the CSRE it was stipulated that rate of wage fixed for any district should be equal to off-season rates for agricultural labourers in the district and should not exceed Rs. 100 per month. The wages realised by labourers in the CSRE varied between Rs. 2.50 to Rs. 4 per day.[85] In the PIREP, wage rates always "lagged far behind the existing rates. There was no parity of wage rates even as between the various executing agencies".[86] In the FFW, the Government of India 'Guidelines' authorised the State Governments to pay wages partly or fully in kind. However, it was reported that the "beneficiaries were compelled to sell part of their foodgrains to meet their cash requirements when payment was made fully in kind. On the other hand, payment of wages fully in cash resulted in misuse of foodgrains by the distributing agencies, particularly by contractors, by way of selling the foodgrains which they got at the price fixed by government in the open market at higher prices".[87] In this programme it was pointed out that 45 per cent of the beneficiaries received their wages both in cash and kind, 46 per cent received only in kind and less than 10 per cent received only in cash.[88] It was observed that 45 per cent of the selected beneficiaries had reported that wages paid were equal to the wages they were already getting under prevalent market rate and another 30 per cent had reported that the wages paid were higher than the market rate. However, the remaining 25 per cent

[83]*Evaluation Report on NREP*, March 1987, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

[84]*Report on Evaluation of Rural Manpower Project*, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

[85]*Study of CSRE*, 1971-74, *op.*, *cit.*, pp. 13-14.

[86]*Report of the Review Committee on PIREP*, August 1977, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

[87]*Evaluation of Food for Work Programme*, August-October 1979, *op. cit.*, 26.

[88]*Ibid.*

maintained that the wages paid were lower than the prevalent market rate.[89] Regarding timely payment of wages, 65 per cent of the selected districts reported that the wages were paid in time.[90] In the NREP, there was "either no uniform practice or rates paid were lower than the mininum".[91] In Gujarat wages were paid on the quantity of work done, in Haryana Rs. 10 per day paid against the minimum wage rate of Rs. 13, in Madhya Pradesh rates paid were lower than the prescribed minimum wages, in Rajasthan wages paid on task basis were less than the prescribed minimum wage.[92] In some states like Jammu and Kashmir and Uttar Pradesh, rates varied from department to department.[93] Besides it was pointed out that there were inordinate delays in payment to workers, for example, in Gujarat it was up to four months, Haryana one month to two years, Jammu and Kashmir up to 18 months, Rajasthan over nine months, Uttar Pradesh up to one year, Tamil Nadu up to two years, Bihar up to seven months, Kerala between five to 20 months, etc.[94]

Impact on Wages

It has been observed that rural employment programmes did not make any impact on the prevailing wage rates. In the PIREP it was reported that this was due to the "ad hoc, temporary and discontinuous nature of the works implemented. The wage rates cannot be expected to rise unless continuity or stability of employment is assured".[95] It was further observed that the wage rates did not rise due to the following factors: "firstly, the local labour was not very much attracted by PIREP as it was not prepared to endanger its time honoured employment with the local agriculturists.

[89] *Evaluation of Food for Work Programme*, August-October 1979, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

[90] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

[91] CAG, *Report, 1983-84, op. cit.*, p. 37.

[92] *Ibid.*

[93] *Ibid.*

[94] *Ibid.*

[95] *Report of the Review Committee on PIREP*, August 1977, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

Also with their traditional masters they got the fringe benefits like festival advance, loans, payments, partly in agricultural produce and also sometimes accommodation. In short, there existed a social relationship between employer and employee, which the labourers would be unwilling to disturb in the absence of a dependable structural change. Secondly, the PIREP works were so staggered that they practically did not affect the existing labour market".[96] In the FFW it was observed that in 65 per cent of the selected districts this programme had no positive effect on the market wages.[97]

Foodgrains Distribution

A major departure in the payment of wages came with the FFW wherein, unlike past practice of payments in cash only, for the first time it was stipulated that the payments will be made partly or fully in kind. This practice is being continued also in the NREP and the RLEGP. In the FFW "there have been wide variations in the quantity of foodgrains allocated, *vis-a-vis*, those released by FCI and utilised by the states/ Union Territories. While on the one hand, allocations which were to have been made on the basis of utilisation reports, continued to be made irrespective of the receipt of such reports, supplies from FCI depended, on the other hand, on the availability of foodgrains in various godowns spread all over the country ... this certainly caused innumerable problems in smooth execution of works under the programme".[98] It was pointed out that foodgrains were supplied to other purpose not covered under the programme and foodgrains were distributed to regular staff of the implementing agencies.[99] It was observed that "erratic distribution of foodgrains, malpractices in distribution particularly by contractors, poor quality of foodgrains, delays in payment due to inadequate arrangements for measurement of earthwork, inflation of muster rolls, sale of foodgrains in open market, etc., were some of the common

[96] *Report of the Review Committee on PIREP*, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

[97] *Evaluation of Food for Work Programme*, August-October 1979, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

[98] Public Accounts Committee 1981-82, *Report*, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

[99] *Ibid.*, 47.

complaints."[100] Considerable delay was observed in supply of foodgrains in a number of villages ranging from five days to 200 days.[101] The problems connected with the distribution of foodgrains were due to variety of factors. "In five states difficulties in the supply of foodgrains were felt because of shortage of stocks in the FCI godowns when the programme was in full swing. The supply was also affected due to the apathy of administration and railways. Another reason was the inadequate number of depots run by the FCI and movements of foodgrains in flood prone areas. The misuses/malpractices were adopted not only by contractors and fair price shops but also by government machinery and Panchayat Samities in varying degrees.... The contractors indulged in selling part of the foodgrains in open market for making extra profit at the cost of the labourers as they were not paid in kind due to delayed supply.... Payment of wages fully in cash was reported in some States leading to selling of the foodgrains in the open market by contractors...Beneficiaries had to sell out their coupons to the owners of fair price shops due to delayed supply of foodgrains".[102] Nearly 79 per cent of the beneficiaries were satisfied with the system of distribution of foodgrains followed in their villages. Those who were not satisfied with the system of distribution gave 'delayed payment', 'inadequate stocks', 'centre not in the village', and 'crowd at fair price shops' as the main reasons of their dissatisfaction".[103] Similarly, in the NREP there has been a declining trend in the foodgrains utilisation. The All India per capita utilisation per day was "0.64 kg. (1981-82), 0.45 kg. (1982-83), 0.48 kg. (1983-84) against the prescribed quantum of one kg".[104] However, per capita utilisation increased to two kg. during (1985-86) and 3.15 kg. per manday during (1986-87),[105] as such there has been an improvement in the food-

[100]Public Accounts Committee 1981-82, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

[101]*Evaluation of Food for Work Programme*, August-October 1979, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

[102]*Ibid.*

[103]*Ibid.*, p. 45.

[104]CAG. *Report, 1983-84, op. cit.*, p. 33.

[105]Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, *NREP—Quarterly Progress Report for the quarter ending* June 30, 1987, para 3.

grains utilisation in the NREP since 198<sup>-86. Some of the reasons for less utilisation was due to quality of foodgrains received, problems in lifting and transportation from distributing points, diversion of foodgrains supplied under the programme through public distribution system, system of making payments in cash being simplier, in several cases the quality of foodgrains supplied was not up to the standard and the workers were reluctant to accept foodgrains as part of their wages and in some cases the foodgrains supplied did not take into account the staple food of the beneficiaries and inadequacy in the public distribution system in rural areas.[106] In case of the RLEGP during 1983-84 the utilisation of the foodgrains was one-third of the total allocations."[107]

Maintenance of the Assets

The maintenance of assets created under various programmes has always been a problem area. In all the programmes it has been provided that maintenance of assets is a responsibility of the state governments. It was further stipulated that the state governments identify the agencies which would be responsible for the maintenance of these assets as well as for making the requisite financial provisions. In the CSRE, maintenance arrangements had not been made in most of the states and where arrangements were made, funds were not provided.[108] It was observed that in the NREP "the state governments of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Jammu and Kashmir, Meghalaya, Madhya Pradesh, Sikkim, West Bengal and Union Territory Administration of Arunachal Pradesh and Chandigarh made no provision for the purpose".[109] On the contrary, it was reported that Rs. 1,239.43 lakh were utilised

[106]CAG, *Report, 1983-84, op. cit.*, p. 33; and *Evaluation Report on NREP*, March 1985, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

[107]Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, *RLEGP—Quarterly Progress Report for the quarter ending* June 30, 1987, para 7.

[108]*Supplementary Report of the Comptroller and Anditor General of India, 1972-73*, New Delhi, Union Government, (Civil), p. 74.

[109]CAG, *Report, 1983-84, op. cit.*, p. 41.

on the maintenance of assets in six States which was not permissible under the programme.[110] Besides, in Uttar Pradesh Rs. 1,115 lakh had been incurred on maintenance of non-NREP assets.[111] However, a major change in the maintenance of the assets was made during October 1986, when it was permitted by the Government of India that 10 per cent of the allocations under the NREP for the districts could be utilised for the maintenance of the assets for which maintenance funds and systems were ordinarily not available. It is the responsibility of the DRDA to make arrangements for maintenance of these assets.[112] It is also stipulated that maintenance of the assets, created under the RLEGP for which regular systems and funds are not available, may be maintained by the DRDAs from the 10 per cent of the allocations permissible for maintenance of the assets under NREP.[113]

Modifications in the Guidelines

In all the rural employment programmes, there have been frequent changes in the operating guidelines. In the CSRE the guidelines were issued in February 1971 but a number of modifications were introduced for the years 1972-73 and 1973-74. Important modifications in the scheme related to revision of the ratio between cost of labour and cost of material. Earlier the scheme prescribed a ratio of 80 : 20 between the cost of labour and cost of material. Later on, it was decided that "50 per cent of the funds allotted to every district will be spent in such a manner that the expenditure on material, etc., did not exceed 20 per cent of the total expenditure as prescribed and the balance of 50 per cent could be spent in such a manner that the expenditure on material did not exceed 40 per cent of the total".[114] Secondly, it was stipulated in the guidelines that each district will

[110]CAG, *Report, 1983-84, op. cit.*

[111]*Ibid.*

[112]"National Rural Employment Programme" (NREP) and "Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme" (RLEGP), *Manual*, New Delhi, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, October 1986, p. 13.

[113]*Ibid.*, p. 54.

[114]Public Accounts Committee 1974-75, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

get Rs. 12.50 lakh per year. Later on, it was decided that the states/Union Territories, with the prior approval of the Central Government, were permitted to distribute the funds admissible under the rules among their districts in such a manner as may be found equitable.[115] Thirdly, states were allowed to change approved projects which was not permissible when the scheme was launched. Besides, delegation of powers of sanctioning projects from the Centre to the states, permission to incur expenditure on additional field staff, permission to take up construction of rural schools and rural godowns were taken up during the second year of the programme.[116] It was pointed out that an important scheme involving an expenditure of Rs. 50 crore per year should have been "subjected to the closest scrutiny prior to its implementation".[117] It is relevant to incorporate the views expressed by the Department of Rural Development, Government of India, regarding the need for modifications in the Guidelines. "Changes and modifications made in the implementation of the scheme from time to time were with a view to making the scheme more effective. Implementation of scheme, however, well conceived, does throw up problems. The problems and bottlenecks faced in the implementation of the scheme were constantly kept under review and corrective action taken either by way of making modifications in the scheme or by taking other remedial action".[118] It was further pointed out that no detailed consideration both at the Centre and the state levels had been given in the formulation and implementation of the CSRE. It has been pointed out that "the first proposal having been made in November 1970 and the matter finalised in January 1971, the scheme cannot be blamed on the ground of having been rushed through. But the dates of the preparation of the proposal by the Ministry of Finance, its circulation by the Cabinet Secretariat, its consideration by the Committee of Secretaries, its finalisation and then its circulation to state governments for implementation

[115]Public Accounts Committee 1974-75, *op. cit*., p. 13.
[116]*Ibid*.
[117]*Ibid*., pp. 18-19.
[118]*Ibid*., p. 6.

offer evidence of the haste with which the matter was pursued. Further, the state governments were given too short a time (about 15 days only) to formulate and submit their projects to the Central Government, districtwise, without even making sure beforehand whether there was a proper machinery for their execution. The result was that up to March 15, 1971, very few such schemes had been received from the state governments. Besides, on government's own admission "the implementation of this scheme in right earnest could start only from the middle of September".[119]

Similarly, in PIREP, the labour and material ratio which was fixed as 70:30 later on was revised to 60:40 as a number of States did not find it possible to create durable assets within the prescribed ratio for labour and material.[120] The FFW programme was started in April 1977. One of the objectives was better maintenance of public works on which large investment had been made in the past. In December, 1977, the scheme was liberalised as it could not make much headway initially. Subsequently the scheme was modified "to include all items of works, plan and non-plan, provided they resulted in the creation of durable community assets".[121] Similarly, modifications were made regarding allocations of foodgrains "In the first two years (1977-78 and 1978-79) the allocations of foodgrains to various states was made on the basis of realistic requirements received from them. In the third year (1979-80) 50 per cent of the foodgrains were allocated on the basis of rural population in each state and 50 per cent on the basis of their performance in the previous year. Later on, a formula was worked out under which weightage of 75 per cent is given to the number of agricultural labourers/marginal farmers and 25 per cent weightage to incidence of poverty in each state while working out statewise allocation of foodgrains".[122]

Similarly, in the NREP significant modifications have been made since the programme started in April 1981. In

[119]Public Accounts Committee, 1976-77, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[120]*Report of the Review Committee on PIREP*, August 1977, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

[121]*Evaluation of FFW*, (August-October 1979, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

[122]Public Accounts Committee, 1981-82, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

the beginning, it was stipulated in the guidelines that wages will be paid partly in foodgrains and partly in cash. In May, 1982 it was decided that one kg. of foodgrains will have to be essentially paid to the workers as per their wages. Besides, it was stipulated that the rate at which the foodgrains are distributed to workers will not be lower than the price prescribed by the FCI. However, due to the declining trend in foodgrains utilisation a decision was taken in January 1984 to distribute foodgrains to the workers engaged under the programme at subsidised rates. In the NREP, guidelines laid down that the ratio between the wage and material components shall be 60:40 both for individual works and the works in the States as a whole. However, this was changed to 50:50 for a district as a whole in August 1983. Since the beginning of this programme it was maintained that maintenance of the assets is the responsibility of the States and the Union Territories. However, a change has been introduced from October 1986 by which 10 per cent of the allocations under the NREP for a district could be utilised for maintenance of those assets for which maintenance funds are ordinarily not available. It will be the responsibility of the DRDA to maintain such assets. Changes were also affected in the earmarking of allocations in this programme. For example, in the beginning, 10 per cent of annual allocations on the states/Union Territories were ear-marked for social forestry. This allocation was increased in August 1985 by 20 per cent and in October 1986 by 25 per cent.

In the RLEGP 20 per cent of the allocations were ear-marked for social forestry. This 20 per cent has been raised to 25 per cent in 1986-87.[123] Similarly, house construction for SCs/STs was an important activity in the RLEGP, but it was not an earmarked activity. The Seventh Plan envisages construction of one million houses under Indira Awaas Yojana in the plan period under the RLEGP and amounts are earmarked in the Yojana on a year to year basis.[124]

[123] *Annual Report, 1986-87, op. cit.*, p. 25.
[124] *Ibid.*, p. 24A.

Modifications in the guidelines can be attributed to two factors : lack of clarity about the policy framework of the programme and the lack of comprehension regarding the complexity involved in the implementation of the programme. The result is that there have been too frequent changes in the guidelines which affect to a large extent, not only the programme but also creates a communication gap in the field agencies.

Monitoring

All the rural employment programmes provided for submission of monthly and quarterly progress reports to enable proper planning and administration of the programme both at the Centre and the state levels. However, "The inability to interpret satisfactorily the trends of utilisation of funds and employment generation under CSRE as between districts, is partly the product of lack of a properly laid out monitoring system."[125] The submission of monthly, quarterly and half yearly progress reports were very much delayed. In the absence of such reports the Centre "did not know as to what was happening in the States".[126] It was further observed, "Another lacuna related to the inadequate or inaccurate information contained in these reports in respect of the physical achievements. Physical achievements both in terms of the number of mandays for which employment had been provided under various schemes as well as in terms of the area brought under minor irrigation, soil conservation, afforestation and other schemes and the mileage of roads constructed had to be reported fully and accurately. The information received was either incomplete or inaccurate, it was difficult to analyse data and arrive at meaningful conclusions".[127]

It was observed in the FFW that monthly and quarterly reports were received late and the period of delay ranged from one to eight months and one to six months res-

[125]*Study of CSRE, 1971-74, op. cit.*, p. 29.
[126]*Report of the Review Committee on PIREP*, August 1977, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
[127]*Ibid.*

pectively.[128] Similarly, out of the 20 selected districts, no information was available from seven districts on the method of progress reporting. In the remaining 13 districts the implementing agencies did send the periodical progress reports to the concerned authorities".[129] In this connection, it was pointed out that "obviously the Ministry themselves did not take those defaults seriously and allow not only the guidelines to be violated but the monitoring system itself to get vitiated and diluted".[130]

In the NREP, there was delay in the submission of monthly and quarterly progress reports. Delay in submission of monthly reports ranged from two to 14 months in 1981-82, one to 12 months in 1982-83 and one to nine months in 1983-84. Delay in case of quarterly reports ranged from one to 13 months in 1981-82 and 1982-83 and one to seven months in 1983-84".[131] Physical monitoring through field inspection was prescribed in the guidelines on NREP, however, in "15 out of 25 states/Union Territories, the compliance of these requirements was not in evidence".[132]

The review made in this chapter has clearly shown that there has been considerable gap between the objectives of the successive rural employment programmes and their outcomes. As the same time, since the Sixth Plan, heavy reliance has been put in the overall framework of anti-poverty strategy on these programmes. This has resulted in providing more resources to these programmes. In Section II of this volume, an attempt has been made to understand the implementation processes in a systematic manner, *i.e.*, why there is "often imperfect correspondence between policies adopted and services actually delivered."[133] This analysis has been attempted within the theoretical framework developed so far on the policy implementation process, as explained, in the 'introduc-

[128]Public Accounts Committee, 1981-82, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

[129]*Evaluation of Food for Work Programme*, August-October 1979, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

[130]Public Accounts Committee, 1983-84, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

[131]CAG, *Report, 1983-84*, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

[132]*Ibid.*

[133]D.S. Van Meter and C.K. Van Horn, *op. cit.*, p. 446.

tion' of this volume. For this purpose, the implementation of the NREP has been analysed in two districts of a state. The systematic examination of implementation will provide not only an explanation of the constraints in achieving the objectives of this programme but also the basis to close the gap between expectations and effects so far as rural employment programmes are concerned.

tion of this volume. For this purpose, the implementation of the NREP has been analysed in two districts of a state. The systematic examination of implementation and process not only an explanation of the constraints in achieving the objectives of this programme but also the basis to close the gap between expectations and effects so far as rural employment programmes are concerned.

SECTION II

3

OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to understand the processes involved in the implementation of the NREP so as to understand the problems which affect the realisation of its objectives.

Objectives

Broadly, the objectives of the study were:

— to what extent the output of the implementing agencies and/or the eventual impact of the implementation process consistent with the official objectives; and
— to what extent the objectives and basic strategies in the programme guidelines were modified during the course of its implementation.

In this study an attempt was made to understand the processes on the following aspects:

— *Planning*—in terms of priorities enunciated by the Centre and the state government process of formulation of shelf of projects and annual action plan.
— *Administrative Set-up and Coordination*—for the implementation of the programme at the work site level, block level and district level. Coordination processes between Rural Engineering Service (RES), District Rural Development Agency (DRDA), block agency and Panchayati Raj Institutions on the one hand and on the other DRDA and agencies like social forestry, public works department, Food Corporation of India (FCI) and foodgrains distributing societies.
— *Criteria of Allocation of Funds*—to the blocks, social forestry and public works department.

— *Employment Generation*—calculation of mandays in the preparation of annual action plan and number of days employment provided.
— *Payment of Wages*—periodicity of payment, method of payment.
— *Distribution of Foodgrains*—process and procedure adopted in the lifting, transportation and distribution.
— *Social Forestry*—criteria of allocation of funds, planning for social forestry works, problem of maintenance, survival rate and adequacy of funds, etc.
— *Public Works Department*—criteria for allotment of grant, planning for road works, problems associated with release of grant and maintenance, etc.
— *Technical Component*—standards and specifications regarding building works and the mechanism adopted for overseeing the fulfilment of these specifications.
— *Maintenance*—both in terms of allocation of funds and administrative arrangements.
— *Wage and Material Components*—the problem as perceived by the executing agencies in maintaining the wage and materials ratio.
— *Monitoring System*—methods adopted for assessing the progress and review of the programme at the block and district levels.

METHODOLOGY

A suitable methodology was adopted with regard to selection of districts, blocks, works and beneficiaries.

Districts

This study was conducted in Madhya Pradesh and two districts Durg and Raipur were selected on the basis of cash utilisation, employment generation, foodgrains distribution and assets created. In the selection of these districts weightage was also given to critical socio-economic indicators like ratio of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (SCs and STs), drought proneness of the area, development of agriculture, percentage of people below the poverty line, and incidence of bonded labour.

Blocks

For this study, seven blocks were selected (four blocks of Raipur district and three blocks of Durg district). This was done on the basis similar to the one used in the selection of the districts. Out of the seven blocks, three were tribal (two blocks of Raipur and one block of Durg) and the remaining four blocks were in the category of community development blocks with a significant proportion of population of SCs and STs. Table 3.1 shows population profile of Durg and Raipur districts including SCs and STs. Table 3.2 shows profile of blocks surveyed including number of villages, number of gram panchayats, total population and population of SCs and STs.

Works

In the selection of the works main emphasis was given to the on-going works and adequate weightage was given to the panchayat and forestry sectors. For this purpose, 42 on-going works were surveyed. Besides 20 incomplete works of all the sectors were also surveyed.

Beneficiaries

Two hundred beneficiaries engaged in the on-going works of all the categories were interviewed. The purpose was to collect information from these beneficiaries regarding payment of wages, duration of employment, periodicity of wages and total earnings from the works.

In addition, information was also collected from government circulars, reports, progress reports, shelf of projects, annual action plan, both at the block and the district levels, pattern of release of grant from the state government to the DRDA and from the DRDA to the blocks and from the blocks to the works. Attention was also given to understand the system of distribution of foodgrains specifically with regard to coordination between the FCI and the DRDA and the lead and link societies and problems faced thereto. Information was also collected from the Rural Engineering Service (RES) personnel at district and block levels and from panchayat institutions regarding the implementation of the programme.

4

ADMINISTRATIVE SET-UP

Before examining the implementation process in the NREP, it is necessary to describe briefly the administrative set-up, so as to get a close look at the agencies executing the programme. Basically the following agencies are involved in the implementation of this programme:

— Department of Panchayat and Rural Development;
— Rural Engineering Service;
— Collector/District Development Officer;
— District Rural Development Agency; and
— Panchayat Institutions.

Department of Panchayat and Rural Development

At the state level, the Department of Panchayat and Rural Development has got overall responsibility in the policy and implementation of this programme. To this end, this department issues from time to time various instructions which are binding on the field level agencies. These instructions touch almost all the important aspects of this programme from planning to implementation, finance and monitoring, and inter-relationship between the executing agencies.

Rural Engineering Service

Madhya Pradesh is one of the few states in the country where technical cell in the Department of Panchayat and Rural Development was created in 1981 to look into the technical component of the rural works programme. This service is known as Rural Engineering Service (RES). It was created primarily due to the reason that in executing local development works in rural areas, experience indicated that technical guidance is necessary for the execution and maintenance of such works. Normally, before the creation of the RES a sub-

engineer was appointed in every development block but there was no arrangement for inspecting the work of the sub-engineer and to provide him necessary guidance. At the same time the works carried out by local organisations were not found satisfactory as there was no proper techical control and proper maintenance thereof. Therefore, the RES was constituted with a view to implement small schemes in rural areas. With this end in view, the RES was created with two-fold objectives:

1. to exercise technical control on all construction work under the NREP and other departmental programmes in the jurisdiction of the panchayat and render technical guidance and advice to the local authorities for planned execution of these works; and
2. to execute and finalise construction works of other departments of the state government costing up to Rs. two lakh which are not located in the district and tehsil headquarters.

The superintending engineer with his auxiliary staff in the Office of the Development Commissioner is available to the village panchayats for construction works at the state level. There is an executive engineer at the divisional level and two assistant engineers at the district level and two sub-engineers in each development block.

In order to oversee that the construction works are executed in a well planned way and technical and financial control is duly exercised on these works, the government from time to time had taken decisions and issued orders as under:

1. The Public Works Department Manual and the Central Public Works Accounts Code are applicable to all construction works undertaken by this service so that technical and financial control is maintained and the account is audited by the Accountant General.
2. All the executive engineers in this service have been declared drawing and disbursing officers.
3. In order that all technical, financial and administrative duties which are entrusted to this service are

completed during the specified period, every executive engineer and the assistant engineer has been given technical office staff corresponding with the officers of the other technical departments.

4. In order that the construction works are executed strictly in accordance with relevant specifications, the technical guide books published by the Department of Panchayat and Rural Development has been made applicable to all construction works.
5. All executive engineers have been declared heads of their offices.
6. In order that close technical control in remote places of rural areas and timely inspection of all construction works are possible, conveyance have been sanctioned for all executive engineers and assistant engineers of this service so that they may carry out detailed inspection of the works.
7. So far as the works within the jursidiction of panchayat areas are concerned, the procedure is already fixed. According to this all the construction works of the panchayat are executed by the block development officer (BDO) through the gram panchayat. These works are not executed through contract and the accounts of these are maintained in the block development office for which the BDOs are fully responsible.
8. Tendering technical advice on these works, inspecting them and exercising technical control is the duty of the concerned officers of the RES.
9. But in case of minor irrigation works and construction works of other departments costing up to Rs. two lakh in rural areas and their maintenance are executed by the RES directly. For these works the procedure to be followed is as prescribed by the state government for corresponding works of other technical departments. In other words, all these works shall be executed departmentally or by contract after obtaining administrative approval and technical sanction.

It was mentioned in the administrative set-up of this

service, that it is necessary on the one hand to retain the local administrative guidance of the divisional, district and block levels intact in the well organised execution of the construction works in the rural areas, and on the other hand to give to the RES the powers and facilities corresponding to those enjoyed by other technical departments for executing the works of other departments properly and within the time limit. The main purpose was that the construction works of any amount may not only be executed properly, but also are subject to strict technical and financial control. Keeping this in view the administrative structure of this service is similar to that obtaining for officers of the divisional, district and other levels under the Directorate of Panchayat and Rural Development. In other words, administratively, the executive engineer, the assistant engineer and the sub-engineer shall work under the divisional commissioner, the district collector and the BDO respectively. In respect of works of other departments they retain their entity like the corresponding officers of other technical departments. The executive engineer is responsible for the pay, travel allowances, etc., of the staff under him and the assistant engineer for the staff as well as the sub-engineers. The pay and allowances, etc., of the sub-engineers are disbursed through the BDOs. The tour programme of the assistant engineer is approved by the executive engineer and that of sub-engineer is sanctioned by the assistant engineer through the BDO.

It is evident from the above that the officers of the RES have to shoulder dual responsibitity, *viz.*, while in respect of construction works under the jurisdiction of the panchayat, the sub-engineer is responsible to the BDO, assistant engineer to the collector on the one hand, without prejudice to the local administration primacy on the other, the sub-engineer is responsible to the assistant engineer, the assistant engineer to the executive engineer and the executive engineer to the development commissioner.

Collector/District Development Officer

At the district level, the collector is responsible for the implementation of this programme. In Madhya Pradesh, Collector is the Chairman of the DRDA. Specifically whit

regard to the NREP works, the District Development Officer (DDO) on behalf of the Collector functions for matters connected with the administrative approval and monitoring of the programme. The DDO performs the following functions:

1. administrative approval of all the works which are normally sanctioned by the collector. This requires an examination of all the works costing over Rs. 25,000 on behalf of the Collector;
2. review the progress every month in a meeting presided over by the collector and attended by executive engineer (RES), executive engineer (PWD), district forest officer, the block development officer and assistant engineer (RES); and
3. distribution of foodgrains to the blocks and other executing agencies.

District Rural Development Agency

The main functions of the DRDA with regard to the NREP are as follows:

1. approval of annual action plan pertaining to blocks and other agencies;
2. release of grant to blocks/agencies with the approval of the collector. In previous years, the NREP grant was given to the collector by the state government for onward disbursement to the BDOs. From 1983-84, the state government took a decision to disburse the grant through the DRDAs. Now this amount is debited in DRDAs (Personal Deposit Account); and
3. to coordinate distribution of foodgrains with the FCI on the one hand and lead and link societies on the other.

Panchayat Institutions

The Madhya Pradesh Panchayats Act was enacted in 1962. Since then, the Act has been amended many times. Major amendments took place in 1981 and in 1984. The Madhya Pradesh Panchayats Act (Sanshodhan Adhiniyam)

1984, provided for a gram panchayat at the village level, a janpad panchayat at the block level and a zila panchayat at the district level. This Act is a comprehensive document and covers the entire field of local self-government through out the state. The panchayats are empowered to deal with several aspects of civic life of the rural population and in some cases they are required to do much more than the municipal bodies.

The gram sabha is the general body of the village panchayat and consists of all eligible voters in the jurisdiction of a gram panchayat. The sarpanch and up-sarpanch of the gram panchayat are the *ex officio*, sarpanch and up-sarpanch of the gram sabha. The term of both the sarpanch and the up-sarpanch is five years. The gram panchayat is the executive body of the gram sabha. The gram panchayat consists of 10 to 20 elected members. The members of the gram panchayat, *i.e.*, panchs are elected on a system based on territorial wards. However, seats are reserved for women and SCs and STs.

The Act has made the janpad panchayat responsible for the implementation of the community development programmes. Besides, the janpad panchayat is also charged with the preparation and implementation of development plans for the block. The janpad panchayat is vested with specific executive responsibilities in fields like primary education, health, sanitation, and communication.

The zila panchayat in Madhya Pradesh exercises powers of supervision and guidance over the janpad panchayat and is also empowered to supervise the working of the panchayats.

The gram panchayat at the village level is the basic institution for planning and executing the development programmes. The janpad panchayat prepare plans for the area and execute it through the gram panchayats, functional committees and the block staff. The janpad panchayat, like the gram panchayat, have full freedom in framing its budget. The zila panchayat is a house of elders, entrusted with the responsibility of supervising and coordinating the work of gram panchayats and janpad panchayats, promote cooperation between them and acting as a channel of information and guidance.

5

LOCAL PLANNING PROCESS

This chapter examines the various processes necessary for planning and execution of the works. These processes are examined in terms of activities which are required in the fulfilment of the planning and execution of the programme. These activities are:

— Planning: priorities, formulation of shelf of projects and annual action plan.
— Processes required before the works are implemented.
— Pattern of release of grant to blocks and other agencies.

These processes are examined with reference to:

— administrative directions issued by the Department of Rural Development of the state government from time to time for the fulfilment of the planning and implementation of the programme; and
— to analyse the operation of these directions and give supporting data so as to pin-point dysfunctionalities in the programme with reference to planning and implementation.

Before describing the process of local planning, it is necessary first to look at the priorities for the selection of works as decided by the state government. The Central Government guidelines give a long list of works that can be undertaken under this programme. The state government in their instructions regarding priorities have conceded that all the works indicated in the guidelines announced by the Central Government can be taken under this programme. But looking at the

conditions of the villages in the state and the requirement of development, the state government decided that the following works shall be given priority.

Primary school building, construction of nistar tank, (its extension and improvement) buildings for children homes, buildings for fair-price shops, bricks and edge paving on the village roads and construction of drains for water drainage.

Under the local planning for this programme, there are two requirements, the preparation of shelf of projects for three and five years period and preparation of annual action plan. For both these, elaborate instructions have been given by the state government to the local authorities.

Shelf of Projects

The instructions issued by the state government indicated that keeping in view the local requirements and the probable funds availability in every district, the shelf of projects should be prepared for new works to be executed during the period of three to five years. In the preparation of these projects each block shall collect information covering each gram panchayat and village on the basis of its needs from the point of view of the community as a whole. The preparation of shelf of projects shall be a continuous process so that with the changing conditions and times necessary modifications can be made in the shelf of projects. The shelf of projects should finally be got approved by the Governing Body of the DRDA and in its preparation local public representatives and panchayats should be consulted so that these are prepared with due regard to local requirements.

Annual Action Plan

The state government directions indicate that on the basis of shelf of projects, annual action plan should be prepared and got approved by the DRDA before the commencement of the financial year. In March 1984, the state government in order to bring uniformity in the preparation of the annual action plan directed the district and block agencies:

— While preparing the annual action plan for the year 1984-85, all the works which remained incomplete by

the end of 1983-84 shall necessarily be included in the programme for the year 1984-85. It would be necessary to indicate the estimated amount needed for completing these works.

— While chalking out the annual action plan, effort should be made to include one or two works of every panchayat in the plan so that people in the entire development block may get equal opportunities of employment. As such, while preparing the annual action plan, those panchayats in which there are no incomplete works or there is very marginal work left new works should be undertaken in such panchayats on the basis of priorities already set up by the government.

— While fixing the annual action plan, proposals should be made after discussing with the representatives, *i.e.*, sarpanch, local MLAs, MPs and other important persons, etc., so that the annual action plan may be made in keeping with the local requirements and there may be no necessity to change them afterwards.

— Regarding the works to be carried out through the village panchayats it was decided by the state government that the works shall not be done on the basis of Current Schedule of Rates. This will be executed on the basis of standard cost, standard design and standard specifications. In the proposals for works, the standard cost as prescribed by the department shall only be indicated. So far as the completion of the incomplete works is concerned, the estimate of the incomplete works or remaining works shall be prepared as per previous procedure and cost assessed accordingly.

— The state government also gave directions for reserving 20 per cent of the amount for works of social forestry and 10 per cent for works specially benefitting the SCs and STs. The state government directed the block and district agencies that it should be clearly mentioned against such works that these works are so proposed. It was also emphasised that in

the allotment to be made for the year 1985-86 it will be clearly mentioned as to how much out of the entire sum is meant for the social forestry and for the works of the tribals and harijans. While preparing the annual action plan the works to be executed by the various departments, *i.e.*, PWD, Forest, Irrigation, etc., should also be necessarily included. As such information about the works to be done by all the departments should also be obtained and the total sanction about departmental works should be included in the annual action plan.

— The number of expected mandays generated for each work would be included in the annual action plan and mentioned against the works. It was also emphasised that the works proposed in the annual action plan for the year 1984-85 should be those which have been already included in the shelf of projects made earlier. If in the annual action plan some works are included which did not find place in the shelf of projects then such works ought to be included in the shelf of projects also. The state government also directed the block and district agencies that those works which are complete but no valuation was done, priority should be given for the valuation of such work at an early date.

Planning for Social Forestry and Rural Works

The allocation of funds to the forest department and the PWD for the works to be undertaken under the NREP is made by the Rural Development Department of the state government. The state government in August 1983 gave following instructions regarding the planning and the type of works, to be undertaken under both social forestry and rural roads:

— All the works to be undertaken by these departments should be approved by the DRDA. Forest department was also permitted to put trees on the road sides including fencing for the saplings on the condition that the finances to be incurred should not be more than 40 per cent in the material component.

Any watch and ward staff needed for the protection of the saplings will be paid on the basis of prevailing minimum wages and the expenditure incurred so will be debited to the NREP funds. It was also mentioned that there is no provision for purchase of tractors and trollies for this work in the budget of the NREP.

— Regarding, PWD works to be undertaken under the scheme, the Department of Rural Development of the state government specifically mentioned that utility of the roads in development should be the only criterion for giving priorities in the construction of village roads. For the year 1984-85, Collector, Raipur district allocated Rs. two lakh for each Legislative Assembly constituency.

For the year 1984-85, the state government directed in those Assembly constituencies where there are no roads under the plan, in such areas rural roads should be constructed under this scheme. The executive engineers (PWD) were asked to prepare a detailed plan and get it approved from their competent superior officers before the execution of the scheme. The state government on the basis of standards estimates provided the norms.

Procedural Requirements

The schemes under the programme have to undergo various formalities before they are put in operation. For this, we have to closely look at both financial and administrative powers. The state government decided in April 1983 that funds released from this programme will be deposited in the personal accounts of the BDOs and divisional forest officers and executive engineers of the PWD. In connection with the works, the powers of financial and technical sanction and the limits have been given on next page:

Nature of powers	*Delegated authority*	*Limit up to (Rs.)*	*Remarks*
(*1*)	(*2*)	(*3*)	(*4*)
(*a*) Powers for according administrative sanction	Divisional Commissioner	3,00,000	The cost of construction of works done through the village panchayat shall not exceed Rs. 50,000
	Collector	1,25,000	
	Sub-Divisional Officer	25,000	
	Block Development Officer	15,000	
(*b*) Powers to accord technical sanction	Superintending Engineer (RES)	3,00,000	The financial limit of works carried out departmentally shall not exceed Rs. 3,00,000
	Executive Engineer (RES)	1,25,000	
	Assistant Engineer (RES)	50,000	

It has been already made clear earlier that the state government decided to dispense with the need for technical sanction of the individual works from the financial year 1984-85 but the government kept old rules regarding valuation and quantum of grant intact. The state government had prescribed the following yardsticks with regard to advance payment to the recipients of the funds:

Instalment/ (percentage of total cost)	*Building works*	*Road works*
(*1*)	(*2*)	(*3*)
1st (15)	for foundation work	50 per cent of cost of earth work
IInd (30)	for masonary work up to roof level	50 per cent of cost of earth work

(1)	(2)	(3)
IIIrd (30)	roofing, flooring and plastering	50 per cent cost of spreading moorum and culvert work
IVth (25)	finishing, sanitary, electrification and completing the work (after the competent authority has inspected)	50 per cent cost of spreading moorum and culvert work

The state government had also decided that the amount to be given under the development works to the panchayats would be billed in instalments under the signature of the sarpanch/chairman, Construction Committee, and the money be deposited directly in the panchayat fund. From this amount, money should be withdrawn as and when needed on the basis of the progress of the work. For withdrawing the money a resolution shall be passed from time to time by the Construction Committee, which will be authorised for withdrawal. Under no circumstances, money in excess of the timely requirement shall be withdrawn and kept as advance. The amount given to the sarpanch/chairman Construction Committee, shall be credited to the account of the panchayat and the account of money withdrawn from the panchayat fund for the development works shall be maintained in the accounts of the panchayat.

It was also impressed by the state government to the block and RES personnel that after the release of the first instalment, entry should be made in the measurement book regarding the commencement of the works as well as the amount released in the first instalment. Subsequently, other instalments should be entered by the sub-engineer in the measurement book along with the description, measurement and valuation of the work. On the basis of these entries to the BDO will release the subsequent instalment and also make an entry in the measurement book.

Before the release of the third instalment, the sub-engineer will verify/value the construction work and also will

make an entry in the measurement book. The last valuation of the work will be done by the sub-engineer and it will be countersigned by the BDO. It is necessary to obtain the signature of the sarpanch (Chairman, Construction Committee) on this valuation, so that he is aware of value of the work.

Another important formality which is observed before the commencement of the work is an agreement with the block agency and the executing agency, *i.e.*, Panchayat.

Control and Supervision

At present these works are executed by the BDO through the concerned village panchayats. The following directions were issued by the state government:

— Detailed drawings and estimates for each work shall be prepared by the concerned sub-engineer and after being duly recommended by the BDO these are submitted to the competent authority for technical sanction.
— On the basis of the technical sanction, the competent authority will give administrative approval.
— The BDO shall not start any work without obtaining the technical sanction and administrative approval. If for any reason he is compelled to do so he shall inform the collector assistant engineer clearly stating the reasons why he was required to start the work without obtaining the sanction and send the drawings and estimates for technical sanction to the assistant engineer. It will be the duty of the assistant engineer to inform the senior officers immediately and if necessary, take action to regularise the works by obtaining sanction in writing.
— Under this programme, all the works shall be executed by the BDOs through the panchayats in accordance with the sanctioned drawings, estimates and specifications prescribed. These works shall not be executed directly or indirectly through contract.
— The technical control on all construction works to be executed in the development block shall rest with the officers of the RES. The BDO shall present all

records/papers connected with the works to the assistant engineer/executive engineer for perusal at the time of inspection or otherwise whenever necessary.

— The measurements of all the construction works in the BDO's jurisdiction shall be assessed and recorded in the measurement book by the sub-engineer from time to time. The assessment register maintained at the block level shall be available for perusal of the senior officers any time.

— Before issuing the completion certificate, the BDO shall inspect the work himself and collect the factual information about the work and record his remarks accordingly on the certificate.

With the above aims in view, standard plans were prepared by the RES to afford guidance in the satisfactory execution of works to be done under the programme.

In March 1984, the state government on the basis of the working of the RES felt that this programme has not received so far full assistance and guidance from its personnel. Their cooperation has been limited to the inspection of sites, framing the estimates and finally valuing the works. It was felt that this state of affairs should change forthwith. In this connection, it was directed by that RES personnel available at block, district and divisional levels be charged with the responsibility of affording cooperation and guidance in the works to be taken up under this programme right from the date of sanction to the completion of works and for their maintenance. This directive also added that it will be their responsibility that all works (except those being carried out by the PWD and the Forest Department) are completed on the basis of the estimates after properly selecting the sites and executing them in time and in a technically sound manner. As several works under this programme are being executed by panchayats technical guidance and cooperation is needed by them. The directive mentioned that in those works that are being done by panchayats the sub-engineer of the block should extend his cooperation. If the work pertains to the construction of school building, then the headmaster or any other teacher of the school shall

be co-opted as a member. The responsibility for maintaining the accounts and making payments will rest with the organisation receiving the funds. This directive also mentioned further that the progress of the work, its technical supervision, providing guidance, making it technically sound, will be the responsibility of the sub-engineer and senior officers of the RES. For this, the Construction Committee will sanction and incur the expenditure in accordance with the progress of the work. It was emphasised arrangement should be made at the block level to entrust each sub-engineer with the responsibility for a well defined jurisdiction so that they work and cooperate with the panchayat and render guidance to the Construction Committee. This directive emphatically commented that responsibilities of the sub-engineers should not be limited to the valuation of works alone.

The state government in March 1984, also decided to dispense with technical sanction and current schedule of rates system due to delay in technical sanction of the works. The government decided that in respect of the works executed by the village panchayats under the programme, the procedure of technical sanction and completion certificate should be simplified and the aim of utilisation of indigenous material and giving maximum labour utilisation should be made predominant. It was decided that for the works executed by sanctioning grants to the village panchayats under this programme the administrative approval should be accorded on the basis of prescribed drawings, specifications and standard costs. For this, technical sanction separately in every case will not be necessary. The grant to be given shall be on the basis of these specifications, drawings and standard costs. The number of instalments will be the same as prescribed earlier. The aim of the inspection and guidance by the engineers of the RES shall be to execute the works within the standard costs and to have a technically durable construction. They will be responsible for giving complete guidance to the panchayats according to the directions announced earlier. On completion of the work the Construction Committee of which the sub-engineer is a member shall certify that the work has been completed. For this a completion certificate by any other authority shall not be separately required. The

assistant engineer will inspect the completed works in 10 per cent cases but it will not require a completion certificate.

The state government also devised designs, specifications, standard costs in case of panchayat bhavan, primary school building, well, road, etc. All works under the NREP were based on the above mentioned costs and specifications. In case of any new work for which specifications, plans and standard costs are not made in such cases, these should be prepared and sent to the state government, Department of Rural Development for sanction.

The state government also gave directions that under this programme only locally available material should be used in the construction works and only that material should be purchased which is absolutely necessary. It also clarified that if some village Panchayats are prepared to provide roofing with costly material like reinforced cement and concrete, this may be allowed as a special case and on the condition that extra funds required for this are collected and used by them to the extent of at least 50 per cent in affording employment by way of labour component.

DYSFUNCTIONALITIES IN THE PLANNING PROCESS

Shelf of Projects and Annual Action Plan

It is proposed to analyse the dysfunctionalities in the formulation of both shelf of projects and annual action plan. Table 5.1 shows the shelf of projects prepared by the blocks of Raipur district for the years 1985-86 to 1989-90. It is evident from this table that in terms of grant required the minimum outlay was Rs. 23 lakh and the maximum approximately Rs. 89 lakh. The number of works proposed also varied from 75 to 820. Most of the blocks prepared schemes which in terms of outlays were more than double the anticipated grant. It is also pertinent to note that in the preparation of shelf of projects both three yearly and five yearly during 1981-82 and 1983-84: (*i*) no conscious effort was made to take works which benefit the weaker sections of the community; (*ii*) no priority was given to those areas which have predominant population of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes; (*iii*) no priority to those pockets in which there was persistent

complaint of existence of concealed bonded labour; and (*iv*) as well as no priority was attached to those pockets where there were reports of under payment of agricultural labour in comparison to the prescribed minimum wages or pockets which were identified as low wage areas. The type of works proposed in the shelf of projects of almost all the blocks surveyed did not reflect the felt needs of the rural poor due to the compulsions of undertaking such works which have been included in the priorities already decided by the state government. Similar situation prevailed in case of Durg district also. It is surprising to note that though emphasis is laid both in the Central guidelines and the instructions issued by the state government that the annual action plan should be prepared only on the basis of shelf of projects but we have seen in the case of Nagri block of Raipur district that annual action plan for the year 1984-85 bore no resemblance in terms of works proposed and locations, with the three yearly shelf of projects prepared for the years 1983-84 to 1985-86. As such the whole exercise of preparation of shelf of projects became a futile exercise. It is taken more as a ritual than an indicator of future guidelines based on long term perspective of the felt needs of the concerned area. A similar situation prevailed in Mainpur, Baghbahara and Saraipalli blocks of the Raipur district.

In the preparation of the annual action plan most of the demands which came from gram panchayats do not take into account the felt needs of the rural poor. In fact, it is the janpad which decides the works to be taken in the annual action plan of the block. There is lot of political bargaining while including the works in the annual action plan, as each gram panchayat tries to include the works in annual action plan. Due to this reason the number of proposed works and expenditure in the annual action plans very much more than the anticipated grant as shown in Table 5.2.

For example, Dhamda block of Durg district proposed for the year 1984-85, 198 new works and 17 old works within an outlay of approximately Rs. 39 lakh while the grant received was only Rs. five lakh during 1984-85. Similar situation prevailed in Balod and Dondi blocks of Durg district during 1984-85 and 1985-86. While in Raipur district almost in all the

blocks there were not much difference between the works and outlays proposed in the annual action plan for the year 1984-85 and the total grant received during the same year. But during the year 1985-86 in the four blocks of Raipur district, the proposed works and expenditure was almost two to four times that of the total grant received during the preceding year.

It is obligatory to get the annual action plan approved by the Governing Board of the DRDA. It is also important to note that for the year 1985-86 in the Durg district the annual action plan was approved in May 1985 (Table 5.3). But in case of Raipur district the annual action plan for the year 1985-86 was not approved till July 15, 1985. Although, in Baghbahara block of Raipur district, 18 new works included in the annual action plan were taken up without the approval of the annual action plan by the DRDA. In this block, 18 new works were started during May 1985 and all these works were such in nature which required the sanction of the BDO and the SDO only and the first instalment of Rs. 1.50 lakh received up to June 1985 was spent on these works. This means in comparison to the grant received during 1984-85 in this block almost 25 per cent grant was spent up to July 15, 1985. Although the instructions issued by the State Department of Rural Development, suggests to take first the incomplete works of the previous years. But in this case the entire first instalment of the grant was spent only on the new works. While no new works were taken up in Mainpur, Nagri and Saraipalli blocks of the Raipur district in the absence of the approval by the Governing Board of the DRDA of the annual action plan for the year 1985-86.

It has been also made clear in the instructions regarding the preparation of annual action plan that the outlay in the plan should not be more than 25 per cent of the grant received in the preceding year. But in practice this instruction is not adhered at all. For example, the annual action plan proposed for the year 1985-86 of the Raipur district, Table 5.4 shows that the expenditure proposed by almost all the 23 blocks of the district varied two to four times of the previous annual action plan outlays. As such no consideration was given to the limit of proposed expenditure not exceeding more than 25 per

cent of the preceding year. Most of the BDOs commented that primarily due to political compulsions they prepare annual action plan of such magnitude. In fact, the BDOs of the blocks surveyed gave different reasons for preparing the annual action plan of such dimension. It was commented by a BDO, that the main consideration in having a large number of works and outlays is due to the fact that we take into account while preparing the annual action plan the capacity of the sarpanchs. Meaning thereby that most of the sarpanchs are not in a position to get the works completed in one financial year. As such a large number of works are taken up which means that instead of getting a fixed number of works completed within the stipulated amount required, a large number of works are opened up. The sarpanchs are not in a position to complete the works due to the following reasons:

— non-availability of skilled labour at the right time;
— sarpanchs themselves are busy in their agricultural work and other social engagements; and
— unskilled workers of the gram panchayat also spend a large part of their time in social ceremonies or their own engagements in agricultural and other related works.

Although this justification is given by most of the BDOs but it is not true. This is a ploy used by the BDOs to open a large number of works. And these works remain incomplete because of the problem of allotment of funds. So much so as may be seen later that most of the construction works linger on for almost more than a year. In this connection, we have also observed that in construction works wherever regular instalments were given and there was proper supervision and valuation the work was completed within a period of one to two months.

Incomplete Works

Annual action plan consists of two parts. Part A comprises of incomplete works and Part B new works to be undertaken and both these parts combined together is called annual action plan. Due to a long list of incomplete works,

the state government decided in 1984-85 and 1985-86 to give priority to the incomplete works. During 1984-85 the state government instructed the district and block authorities regarding various aspects of incomplete works:

— If an agency is not taking interest in the completion of incomplete work, either this agency should be given notice to complete the work or the work should be entrusted to some other agency.
— In those cases where the work is held up due to escalation in cost estimates should be revised on the basis of existing rates and the additional grant should be released to such agencies.
— In those cases where the work is held up due to difference in valuation special teams should be formed for the purpose of valuation.
— In those cases where the agency which was awarded the work is not completing the work as well as not returning the money, in such cases the grant should be recovered and Revenue Recovery Proceedings should be launched against them. In such cases the work should be given to different agency after proper valuation of the work and release of additional grant, if necessary.

It is interesting to note from Tables 5.5 and 5.6 that the number of incomplete works were to the extent of 875 and 328 in Raipur and Durg districts respectively up to April 1985. These figures relate to the works of the panchayat sector alone. It is estimated that the amount required for the completion of such works would be Rs. 105.15 lakh and Rs. 30.15 lakh for Raipur and Durg districts respectively. This comes out to 66 per cent and 22 per cent of the annual allocation of Raipur and Durg districts respectively. The problem of incomplete works in both the districts began as early as 1975-76 when under the scheme of local development works a large number of schemes every year remained incomplete. Table 5.7 shows the type of incomplete works in Durg district. The year-wise statement of incomplete works of Raipur district is given in Table 5.8.

In order to appreciate the problems of incomplete works Table 5.9 shows number of works started, works completed and the remaining works (as on 1.4.1985) including allotment and expenditure during 1984-85 in the four blocks namely, Baghbahara, Saraipalli, Nagri and Mainpur of Raipur district. It is evident that in Baghbahara as on April 1, 1984 the number of incomplete works were 27 while in April 1985, the number of works rose to 29. Similarly, during the same period in Saraipalli the number of incomplete works rose from 43 to 46 and in Mainpur from 17 to 31. Similar situation prevailed in Durg district also. As explained previously at the time of the preparation of the annual action plan due to political compulsions a large number of works are included. As a consequence of this, a large number of works are opened up with total disregard to yearly financial allocations. This problem is also related to the fact that funds given to the panchayat sector is block grant meaning thereby that it is the discretion of the BDO to allocate the grant both in the new works as well as in the incomplete works of the previous years. To put an end to this problem it is necessary that priority should be given first to complete the incomplete works and later on the grant should be released for the new works. It is a known fact that if a building work is not completed within a reasonable period of time, not only the beneficiaries are deprived of the benefit, it also damages the entire structure and increasing the cost of the works. It is evident from Table 5.9 that in Baghbahara 4, Saraipalli 18, Nagri 10 and Mainpur 32 new works were taken up during 1984-85. The total numbur of incomplete and new works in these blocks were 31, 16, 35, and 47 respectively. But during this period the works completed were 10, 15, 11 and 18, *i.e.*, one-third of the total number of works taken up in these blocks during 1984-85. In such a situation, it is difficult to supervise the works and make correct assessment of the problem. Besides giving a lot of discretion in terms of release of grant to works (both incomplete and new) it also results in arbitrary behaviour of the BDOs. It is desirable that only such number of works should be opened which could be completed within the financial year. To put an end to this problem, the incomplete works should be given priority.

Social Forestry and Rural Roads

According to the directive of the state government 20 per cent of the allocation in each district should be made for works relating to social forestry. Under this sector, schemes relating to: fuel and fodder, development, plantation of small timber, free distribution of saplings and road side plantation of trees can be taken up. From 1984-85 a scheme of panchvan has also been introduced. Under this scheme usually the village waste land is taken from the panchayats with an agreement with the Department of Forest for developing fuel wood plantation. This agreement also stipulates that after five years panchvans would be handed over to the concerned panchayats for their use. In both the districts the major chunk of the grant was allocated to the Panchvan scheme. The forest officials regardiing this scheme, commented on the following problems:

— The staff of the social forestry agency is limited and covers three to four blocks of both the districts. As such the works necessarily are planned in these blocks only. As a consequence the spread over of the works is in few blocks only. To this extent it deprives the benefit of this scheme to other blocks.
— In Durg district this agency was established only in 1984. It lacks infrastructural facilities like nursery, etc. Even at some places there is no office for the ranger.
— It was emphasised that this scheme has got certain definite cycle of operations. For example during January-March preparatory work has to be conducted and plantation begins only during June and July. But due to the erratic nature of the release of funds it becomes difficult for them to plan the operations in a scientific manner. It is interesting to mention that the Department of Rural Development, Government of India releases the entire grant to the states in two instalments. It has been emphasised by the department that the grant for social forestry should be given during the commencement of the financial year and full 20 per cent of the allocation earmarked for the forest sector should be paid in one instalment only.

— There is no provision in this scheme both for the replacement of plants as well as watch and ward staff. As such the survival rate of plants is low.

— The complaints of villagers about the scheme relate to two aspects; The social forestry agency do not take them into confidence regarding the type of saplings; and secondly, after the agreement this agency does not consult the villagers at all. As a consequence the villagers are indifferent towards the Panchvan scheme. This non-cooperation from the villagers affects both the maintenance and its development.

Regarding the free distribution of saplings to the villagers following problems were felt by the officials of Nagri range of Raipur district:

— Under this scheme ten saplings were distributed to each family below the poverty line. An important problem faced by the forest officials regarding distribution was that the number of families were less than the number of saplings. In Nagri range, (Raipur district) is a dense forest area, and the people are not much interested in taking the plants. As such the choice of the block was wrong for this type of work. This type of work should be implemented in areas where there is less of forest area. At present under the scheme of free distribution of saplings the survival rate is hardly five per cent which should at least be 50 per cent.

— Another problem relate to the type of saplings distributed. In Nagri range the forest officials commented that the type of saplings given were not acceptable to the beneficiaries. There is a need to provide saplings which are fruit bearing or of commercial use.

— It was commented by the forest officials that village level workers and patwaris should also help in this work. In fact this type of work should be undertaken with the help of gram panchayats and block agency. Instead of giving saplings to the individuals it should be planted in a compact piece of land of the

gram panchayat. The work of forest department should be to provide technical assistance in terms of plantations and fencing. The work of protection should be the responsibility of the gram panchayat and the block agency. In the distribution of saplings, at present there is no follow up.

Rural Roads

Under this programme 10 per cent of the resources are earmarked for rural roads to be constructed by the PWD. The location of the works are decided by the collector in consultation with the local leaders like MLAs and janpad Adhyaksh. Because of the consultation with the political leaders the locations are primarily political in nature. The quantum of allocation of funds to the divisions of PWD in the district is the discretion of the collector. These roads are basically Class I metal roads. Roughly there is a provision of Rs. one lakh to Rs. 1.5 lakh for one km. metal road. Though at some places Class II roads were also constructed. Most of the grant for these works during 1984-85 was released between November 1984 to March 1985. One important problem in the planning of such works is that DRDA at the time of approval of annual action plan is not in a position to pass any judgement on the financial demands put forth by various PWD divisions. For example, in Balod block of Durg district, the road works were taken in those areas where under earlier scarcity works a considerable amount of stone-work had been taken up. It has also been commented that such works were taken up by the PWD where already earth work was done either during scarcity period or by the gram panchayat under NREP. Most of these works in Balod division of Durg district were taken up during January-March 1985. It is also important to look at the allocation of funds to Balod division during 1984-85. As these works are sanctioned by the Collector, no meaningful scrutiny at the DRDA level takes place. This is a serious lacuna in the scheme. The PWD also does not inform the DRDA about the date of commencement of the works. Due to this reason it is difficult for the DRDA to supervise and check the progress of the works and other individual matters related to. It is a common

complaint of the DRDA that by and large, these agencies treat DRDA as a cashier and they do not give information regarding location, progress of work, type of activities undertaken, time of completion of works, etc. It is difficult to evaluate the works and to assess money spent on different items of the works. By and large, consolidation works were undertaken. The DRDA also does not have technical staff to assess and evaluate the works of road construction.

Progress of Works

The Table 5.10 shows the detailed statement of proposed number of works in the annual action plan during 1984-85 in seven blocks of Durg and Raipur districts as well as expenditure proposed and the total grant received during the same year. It is evident from the table that out of the four blocks of Raipur district, in two blocks (Nagri and Mainpur) the grant received during 1984-85 was higher than the expenditure proposed during the same year. This was not true in case of three blocks of Durg district and two blocks of Raipur district.

The percentage variation in works proposed and undertaken in Durg district was found 24 to 50 (see Table 5.10a). It is also evident from the same table that the number of works completed were roughly one-third of the total number of works undertaken in all the blocks. Another important reason for the works remaining incomplete is due to the fact that the grant was received at the fag end of the financial year (a point which will be taken up for detailed analysis later on).

Tables 5.11 and 5.12 indicate allotment during 1984-85 in Durg and Raipur districts. It is evident from the tables that 64 per cent and 56 per cent allotment in Raipur and Durg districts respectively were given to the panchayats. Allotment to the forest department in Raipur district was 14 per cent and in Durg district it was 13.5 per cent of the total grant. During 1984-85, PWD was given 27 per cent and nine per cent of the allotment in Raipur and Durg districts respectively. Irrigation department was given 1.16 per cent in Raipur district while in case of Durg district it was 4.7 per cent.

A consolidated statement is given in Table 5.13 which

shows the type of works undertaken under the programme from 980-81 to 1984-85 in the panchayat sector alone in Durg district. It is evident from the table that almost 50 per cent of the works were taken up under the broad category of earth works, *i.e.*, road, tank and puliarapta. Under the category of building works the major portion of grant spent in school buildings and construction of wells. The type of works undertaken in Raipur district are not very different from that of Durg.

Criteria for Allocation

The Government of India releases its quantum of finance under the programme on the basis of number of agricultural workers, marginal farmers and the incidence of poverty. In Madhya Pradesh up to 1984-85, the state government allocated the total grant, *i.e.*, the Central share and the State share only on the basis of population. In blocks where the population was more than 75,000, an amount of Rs. 5.65 lakh was allocated and in blocks where the population was less than 75,000, an amount of Rs. 4.50 lakh was allocated. During 1985-86, the state government agreed to distribute the allocation to the districts on the basis of 75 per centweight age to the number of rural agricultural labourers and marginal farmers and 25 per cent weightage for the incidence of poverty in the district. In cases where district-wise data of incidence of poverty is not available 25 per cent weightage is given to the number of SCs and STs in the district. The same procedure is followed in distributing the allocation to the blocks. In Madhya Pradesh we have seen from the figures available that the estimates of agricultural workers and the incidence of poverty both district and block-wise are not available. As such during 1985-86 funds were allocated on the basis of number of marginal farmers and number of SCs and STs.

Pattern of Release of Funds

Closely related to the problem of progress of works is that of release of instalments to various agencies and blocks. As we have already seen in the preceding pages that lack of timely allotment to works is a major problem in their completion. For the sake of illustration we have taken

Durg district for overseeing pattern of allotment from the State Development Commissioner and its disbursement by the DRDA to different agencies and blocks during 1984-85. It is evident from Table 5.14 that the grant from the State Development Commissioner to the DRDA was released in 13 instalments. Approximately 66.7 per cent of the total grant to the Durg district was released between the middle of April to end of May 1984 in four instalments. Roughly 16.7 per cent of the total grant was released between October to November 1984 in three instalments and the rest 16 per cent was released between February-March 1985.

Another point which needs to be emphasised concern the allotment and release of grant to the blocks and agencies is the time lag between the issue of allotment letter from the Development Commissioner and its disbursement by the DRDA. This process takes almost, on an average, between one month to one and half months. It was commented by the BDOs that even after the release of the instalments by the DRDA, its encashment from the cooperative banks takes more than 15 days. To circumvent this delay, the collector, Durg district devised a procedure according to which on presentation of cheques and necessary details by the DRDA, the cooperative banks will afford advance credit to all the agencies on the basis of which the banks at the block level will afford a credit letter of the same amount to the respective agencies. In the case of agencies who do not have account with the branch of the cooperative abnks, the branch will issue a bank draft of the same amount so as to provide necessary funds. This procedure has certainly helped to avoid delay in the transaction of funds.

The disbursement of instalments to various agencies and blocks depends on the availability of funds from the development commissioner and it is the discretion of the collector to determine the quantum of instalments to various agencies and blocks. In this connection, it is relevant to look at Table 5.15 so as to have an idea about the pattern of release of grant to agencies other than blocks during 1984-85 in Durg district. It is evident from Table 5.15 that in the social forestry sector the funds were released in four instalments (50 per cent was released in one instalment in June 1984 and the next 50

per cent was released during the quarter of January-March 1985 in three instalments). Similarly in case of PWD, funds were released in six instalments in the months of October, November, January and March. Similar situation prevailed in the case of Irrigation, Soil Conservation, etc. As pointed out earlier, one important problem is that of uncertainty regarding both the availability and timing of the grant, which to a large extent hampers in the progress of the works.

Similarly, in the case of the grant released by the DRDA to the blocks (Durg and Raipur districts) during 1984-85 and up to June 1985 is given in Table 5.16. By and large, the grant during 1984-85 in both the districts were given in 3-4 instalments. While in the Durg district during 1984-85 in Dondi block, 75 per cent of the grant was released in two monthes, *i.e.*, May and June 1984 and in Balod block, 100 per cent grant was released between May and June 1984. In Raipur district in Saraipalli block 90 per cent grant was released between May and June 1984, in Nagri block in Mainpur block 100 per cent grant was released in May and June 1984. This table also gives the pattern of release of instalments up to June 1985 for the financial year 1985-86. Balod block between April and June, a grant of Rs. two lakh which is about 50 per cent of the total grant received during 1984-85 was given. Similarly is Dhamda block. While in case of Raipur district, the percentage of grant varied between 30 to 55 per cent in Saraipalli, Nagri and Mainpur blocks in comparison to the total grant received during 1984-85.

Allocation and Expenditure Pattern

Tables 5.17 and 5.18 show allocation and mandays generated during 1980-81 to 1984-85 in Durg and Raipur districts. It is evident from these tables that the allocation and the expenditure in Raipur and Durg districts increased eight and 10 times respectively. It is also evident that unutilised amount in both the districts was quite small.

6

PROBLEMS OF IMPLEMENTATION

The purpose of this chapter is to analyse the problems encountered in the implementation of the NREP. For this purpose two categories of data were collected: first category of data relate to the type of works undertaken at block level from 1980-81 to 1984-85. For the sake of illustration Dondi block, Durg district was selected; and second type of data were collected from an intensive survey of 42 works (Table 6.1) spread over in the seven blocks of Raipur and Durg districts. Broadly, works of panchayat, PWD and social forestry sectors were studied. In the preceding chapter we have given a detailed account of the type of works undertaken in the Durg and Raipur districts from 1980-81 to 1984-85. This analysis does not reveal much and for understanding the type of activities undertaken at the block level in terms of number of gram panchayats covered, amount spent in each gram panchayat, type of works undertaken, concentration of works and repetition of similar type of works in the same gram panchayat, etc.

Profile of Schemes

Table 6.2 shows gram panchayat-wise profile of works from 1980-81 to 1984-85. This analysis gives an idea on a number of variables mentioned above. Similar situation prevails with marginal variation in other blocks of both the districts. In Table 6.3 workwise expenditure is given. This table shows that in school buildings 34.91 per cent of the amount was spent. Similarly 48 per cent amount was spent in works relating to approach road and tank. In Table 6.4 and Table 6.5 expenditurewise coverage and workwise coverage is given. It is obvious from Table 6.6 that out of the 43 gram panchayats, in the 14 gram panchayats an amount between Rs. 1.20 lakh to Rs. 2.40 lakh was spent and in the 29 gram

panchayats only an amount between Rs. 40,000 to Rs. 1.20 lakh was spent. Similarly in terms of number of works undertaken as shown in Table 6.7 there was concentration of works in eight gram panchayats in which nine to 12 works were undertaken. Table 6.8 shows panchayatwise detail of school works (more than one) in Dondi block for the last five years including total expenditure on the school and total expenditure in the gram panchayats also. Out of 43 gram panchayats, only five gram panchayats are without school and in 20 panchayats there is only one school. But at the same time it is significant to note in this Table that from 1980-81 to 1984-85 in 18 gram panchayats two or more school buildings were constructed. This shows that there is repetition of similar type of works in the same gram panchayat. This leads to gross wastage of resources and also neglecting other basic priorities of the gram panchayats. It is also evident from this Table that on an average 50 to 60 per cent of the total expenditure has been incurred only in the school buildings alone in these 18 gram panchayats but at the same time there are five gram panchyats without school buildings up to 1984-85. This shows that the DRDA does not take into account at the time of approval of the annual action plan the previous assets created under the programme in the gram panchayat. In the absence of information regarding the assets created, the DRDA is not in a position to question the inclusion of such works.

The purpose of this programme is to undertake such works which reflect the felt needs of the area. As explained earlier though the Central guidelines give a long list of works which could be undertaken under the programme, the state government's instructions limit these activities into items like nistar tank, road, school, panchayat bhavan, well, etc. It is well known fact that in the panchayat institutions the leadership is provided, by and large, from the elite class. As such, a high priority is attached to those works which could be shared by the community. This deprives the pockets of SCs and STs of the benefits of the programme. For example, while discussing the problem both with the officials and the non-officials in all the blocks the major need was of drinking water in both the districts. But a low priority was given to

this problem. For the sake of illustration in Sikripalli Gram Panchayat of Baghbahara block, during 1985-86, a well was constructed in a Harijan basti. Though from 1980-81 to 1984-85 a number of works like school building, tank deepening, panchayat bhavan, etc., have been taken up. Similarly, in Parry Gram Panchayat of Dhamda block in Durg district we came to know from the sarpanch that there is only one drinking water well and that too remains dry for four months in a year. The problem of drinking water is so acute that the villagers have to go to fetch water about two kilometers in the summer season. The villagers and the panchayat leaders discussed this problem with the MLAs, officials of the irrigation and public health engineering departments, etc., but no action was taken in this direction. It was suggested by the sarpanch and the villagers that it could easily be done through lift irrigation method from the place where the water is available (which is about two kms.). It was estimated that it would cost between Rs. one lakh to 1.5 lakh. Although in this gram panchayat under this programme from 1980-81 to 1984-85 an amount of Rs. 2.5 to three lakh has been spent but the basic need of the people of the gram panchayat has not been solved. This problem also underscores that despite an elaborate outfit of RES personnel not much is forthcoming from them in terms of rendering technical advice on such issues.

Allotment of Funds and Valuation

Table 6.1 shows the works surveyed in both the districts and it throws considerable light on various aspects of the operational problems in panchayat, forest and PWD sectors. Regarding the panchayat sector the works could be divided in two parts—earth works and building works. Primarily in the case of building works their completion takes on an average more than a year. It is also obvious from the table that in some blocks the instalments were not released according to the criteria laid-down for their disbursement. In some cases the grant was released in six to seven instalments. The reasons given by the BDOs were two-fold—firstly, the intstalments were released according to the requirements of each case; and secondly, BDOs do not want to take the risk in giving full instalments which might lead to their misutilisation. But the

fact remains that curtailment in the norms lead to delay in the completion of the works. As such there is no continuity in the construction of the works. This also means that in building works different sets of labourers were engaged for different spells of time spread over a year or even more.

It was also noticed that the valuation of the building works as shown in measurement books varied from one day to one week before the release of the next instalment. This is probably done in order to show that the works lingered on from the release of the previous instalment to the date of valuation and the release of the next instalment. But in practice to circumvent the problem of allotment to works, valuation is normally conducted only when the funds are available at the block level. Though, it is difficult to establish whether the works were taken up immediately after the release of the instalment or not, all the same it is a confusing state of affairs. As pointed out earlier in building works if the grant is given within a reasonable period of time and the progress of works is evaluated by the sub-engineers and the BDOs regularly, it is possible to complete the works within a much shorter period than is being taken up at present. The present norms of release of instalments and valuation should continue but it should be obligatory on sarpanchs to initiate the works within a week of the release of instalment and there should be no break in the construction activity from the date of commencement to its completion. For this, it is necessary to give the instalments promptly. It is also evident from the table that release of the foodgrains did not synchronise with the release of the cash instalments. It is obvious from column 10 of the table that in the works for which data is available, the quantity of foodgrains as assessed in the works was not provided and mostly cash was given to the labourers.

Earth Works

In earth works we came across a number of problems. The roads which are built under the panchayat sector are kuccha roads. In road construction neither survey is conducted nor is there a provision of culverts, proper alignments, etc. Sometimes money is spent on the same work in subsequent years on construction of culverts and laying of hume pipes.

The release of instalments in earth works were more prompt in comparison to building works. It is also very pertinent to note that in a large amount approximately 25 per cent was spent annually under road construction in all the blocks. The roads constructed are neither durable nor serve the purpose round the year. In a way the road works undertaken under the panchayat sector violates all the norms as stipulated in the central guidelines. Similar situation exists in case of works relating to tank deepening, extension and rejuvination. The cost estimates vary from Rs. 5,000 to Rs. 50,000. The cost estimates are prepared more on the basis of availability of funds than on any detailed survey. It is also important to emphasise that 15 to 20 per cent of grant under this programme was spent annually on earth works.

Another significant aspect both regarding works undertaken under road and tank relate to the fact that in majority of the cases the instalments from the blocks were released by and large in the months of May-June. This raises some very important questions both regarding the timeliness of the release of instalments and the commencement of such works. In most of the cases we have observed that no attention was given to the timing of the works. It is a common knowledge that the monsoon commences in both the districts by early June. If the works are taken during the last week of May or early June then with the onset of the monsoon the works will not be completed and it will also be difficult to have proper measurements of the work done. We came across this aspect in Sikripalli Gram Panchayat (Baghbahara block), Kaspur Gram Panchayat (Nagri block), and Gohrapadar Gram Panchayat (Mainpur block) of Raipur district in the tank deepening works undertaken during May-June 1985. In all the blocks, the time of commencement of such works was more or less the same and full payments were made in all these cases.

Slack Season

An important assumption in this programme is to undertake the works in slack season. But the way the grant was released from the DRDA to the blocks and from the blocks to the works as shown in Table 6.7 this hardly takes place.

For example, we have shown in this table monthwise release of grant to Gram Panchayat works in Nagri, Balod and Mainpur blocks for the year 1984-85. It is evident that in Nagri and Mainpur blocks during 1984-85, two-thirds of the grant was released to the works during the last quarter of the financial year. It is obvious from this that the intensity of the works was also high during this quarter. This is also true in case of works undertaken by the PWD and other agencies. It is also interesting to note that even during this last quarter emphasis was not given for completion of incomplete works of the same financial year but quite a substantive number of works were opened under the panchayat sector.

Recovery

We came across many cases of recovery in the blocks surveyed. This problem arises when either the sanctioned amount has not been utilised or less work has been executed in relation to the grant released to the sarpanchs as valued by the sub-engineer. The position regarding the recovery of grant in the several blocks is given in Table 6.8. In Saraipalli block there were as many as 16 cases of recovery of Rs. 33,418 and except in one case there has not been any progress regarding recovery till June 1985. In Nagri block there were 30 cases of recovery and all cases were sent to the collector on May 19, 1985 for the issue of recovery orders. In case of Baghbahara block there was not a single case of recovery since last five years. Most of the cases in this block were old pertaining to the period between 1970 to 1980. In Mainpur block there were three cases of recovery of the value of Rs. 40,000. All the three cases have been sent to the collector for necessary orders. In case of Balod block there were 12 cases of the value of Rs. 50,000 out of which recovery orders worth Rs. 30,260 have been issued. In Dondi block there was only one case of recovery of the value of Rs. 12,000 and no recovery orders were issued up to June 1985. The delay in issue of the recovery orders are due to political interference. In such cases it is necessary not only to issue the recovery orders but also to change the grantee to facilitate the completion of such works.

Wage and Non-Wage Components in Building Works

The Central guidelines in order to maximise employment has provided for maintaining a ratio of 50:50 for wage and non-wage components respectively in a district as a whole. In general, mandays generated in a work are the progressive total of persons working on each day from its initiation to completion. The proforma prescribed for the formulation of annual action plan mentions as an important variable employment likely to be generated in a work. The BDOs while preparing the annual action plan divide the wage component by the prevailing minimum wage rate for the calculation of mandays. Such a system is quite understandable and correct in case of earth works as in these works there is no materials component and the entire wages are paid to the unskilled labourers. But in case of building works this is not true. For example as shown in Table 6.9 during 1985-86 in Dondi, Baghbahara and Mainpur blocks for construction of a school building of Rs. 50,000 materials cost, cash and foodgrains component, have been given differently in all the blocks, consequently, estimated mandays are also different. There is a difference of estimated mandays to be generated to the tune of 800 for the similar type of work in these blocks. To some extent, this difference is understandable because in the calculation of estimated mandays, a number of factors are involved like location of the place, availability of materials, etc. But by and large the estimated mandays calculated in the building works on the basis of the criteria mentioned above are quite high. On the basis of prevailing rates of material and labour, we discussed this matter with the sub-engineers. Tables 6.10 and 6.11 shows the pattern of expenditure under materials and wage components which comes to 75:25 (materials and wage). In order to strengthen our argument we have also cited the cost index of materials and labour as applicable in the building works. According to this cost index given in Table 6.12 materials and wage comes to 76.5:23.5 in building works. At present there is no distinction made between the employment generated for unskilled and skilled labourers. According to our estimates the wage ratio of unskilled to skilled labour is to the tune of 48:52 in a building work. In a building work of Rs. 50,000 as

shown in Table 6.11 the employment generated would be 780 mandays, *i.e.*, (three masons and 12 labourers for 45 days each and three carpenters and three labourers for 40 days each). As such there is tremendous difference in the actual mandays generated and as estimated in the annual action plans. So much so that in a building work of Rs. 50,000 the mandays generated as mentioned by the blocks were in the range of 2,200 to 3,000 but according to our calculations it should be between 753 to 910 mandays at the most. This analysis shows that there is a need to change the norms governing calculation of estimated mandays especially in building works so as to have a realistic estimate. It also shows potential of employment generation in building works is extremely limited, coupled with the problem as previously mentioned such works are spread over for a longer duration, *i.e.*, a year or even more on an average due to the problem of instalments which in turn necessitates change in the composition of the labourers.

Selection of Labourers and Payment of Wages

At present under this programme there is no system of registration of workers. The size of the works undertaken (especially in building works), permit employment to handful of labourers. Coupled with the problem of allotment, labourers are employed over a period of one year or more in building works different spells of time. While in earth works, by and large, the works are completed in a very short period varying between one week to four weeks at the most. This is possible because of prompt allotment as well as a large number of labourers are employed for its completion. In earth works payments are made on piece rate basis as shown in Table 6.13 and in all the works surveyed in seven blocks the entire family including children used to be engaged in the works. In most of the earth works the labourers were engaged in two shifts. It is also interesting to note that in most of the places where the work was in progress, the labourers did not allow the outsiders to work. It also came to our notice that in building works the sarpanchs by and large employ their own persons. This is because in both the districts the employment opportunities are very limited and the wages given in the programme are much higher than the prevailing market wage rate. We also

came across in Sikripalli Gram Panchayat (Baghbahara block) where residents of a Harijan basti were denied employment on construction of a well in their pocket due to political reasons.

The state government affected change in the minimum wages of agricultural labourers from Rs. 8.60 to Rs. 9.15 from March 1985. According to the prevailing norms the component of cash and kind is Rs. 7.35 *plus* one kg. rice or Rs. 8.65 *plus* one kg. wheat. Most of the workers were aware of this rate including the foodgrains component except in Guchapalli Gram Panchayat (Saraipalli block) and Jamgaon Gram Panchayat (Balod block).

Technical Supervision

It is expected from the sub-engineers of the RES to supervise the technical aspect of the works in the panchayat sector. It was commented by the sarpanchs of Dhamda, Nagri, Saraipalli and Mainpur blocks that the visits of the sub-engineers were very few. So much so that in all the blocks earth works were almost completed without any technical assistance rendered by the sub-engineers. At Kodia gram panchayat, Dhamda block, it was complained by the sarpanch that the sub-engineer did not visit the work site at all and work was near completion. As a result of this, the valuation does not takes place at appropriate time causing delay in release of instalments and as a consequence progress of work suffers. It was also commented by the sarpanchs that they had to visit the block office number of times to request the sub-engineer and the BDO to visit the work site for valuation and technical guidance. Some sarpanchs complained that sub-engineers demand money for valuation and if the money is not given they try to undervalue the work. This problem has increased as the State government since April 1984 had taken away from the assistant engineers (RES) powers to assess 10 per cent of the works in a block. As such, now the final valuation rests only with the sub-engineers. In comparison to Raipur district, in Durg district the position is very different because the collector has not taken away the powers of technical assessment of the 10 per cent of works from the assistant engineer.

As such there is better control and supervision over the sub-engineers in Durg district. As already pointed that on an average there are 12 to 16 running works in a year in a block. Out of these works approximately six to eight works are in the category of earth works. There is a tendency as already pointed out that earth works are undertaken during May-June only. As such in a year one sub-engineer has got hardly three to four building works to supervise under this programme. We also came to know that right from the initiation till its completion the works are completed by the masons without much supervision by the sub-engineer. The state government in April 1984 established Nirman Samiti at work site level consisting of sarpanch, panch of concerned village and the sub-engineer to look after the entire construction work including the disbursement of payments. These committees are not functioning at all. Even the sub-engineers and sarpanchs are not aware of the functions of this committee. The main reason being that the BDOs do not want to share the powers with the members of the Nirman Samiti. These committees have almost became defunct bodies. It is important to realise that Rs. two crore to 2.5 crore are spent every year on RES in the State but in terms of output, responsibilities and workload, this service has not contributed much in the existing set-up. There is a need to go into the organisational structure and working of this service in a through manner for the better utilisation of its personnel.

Durability

As the visits of the sub-engineers are few at work site levels, it affects the quality of works. Though, it is difficult for us to comment on the cost estimates and specifications given for different building and earth works, most of these estimates are based on current Schedule of Rates. In fact, of late, there has been an enhancement in these rates. Table 6.14 shows the enhanced rates which have been increased by almost cent per cent in all the items. But the type of construction which is taking place is technically of inferior quality. It is possible to make more durable and technically sound buildings within the cost estimates provided

for such works. There is a need to go into details of this question by an expert committee. The state government had issued instructions to use the indigenous material especially in the preparation of bricks. Except in Mainpur block no such effort was made in other blocks. The state government's instructions regarding building works has provided tile roofing only. This affects not only durability of the building but also increases the maintenance cost. We came across many buildings which were constructed only two to three years back in which tile roofing were found in a bad shape. To some extent, it also affects the utility of the buildings. As there is no provision for maintenance of the buildings constructed under the programme, the situation is worsening year by year and it affects both durability and life of such buildings. For durable building it is much better to have RCC roofing than the present system of tile roofing. We have been told that the cost in both the cases is almost comparable. In fact in Arjunda Gram Panchayat (Gunderdehi block), Durg district, we visited a Mahila Mandal Bhavan constructed with RCC roofing. It is significant to note that cost in the above work was even less than that of tile roofing. For the durability of the building works, it is essential that the entire specifications and the cost composition given by the state government should be thoroughly reviewed and suitable technical guidelines should be issued for making the buildings more durable and affecting economy in the maintenance. It has been commented that by and large masons in the interiors of both these districts are not conversant with construction of building works with RCC roofing but it is felt that with the help of sub-engineer it will not be difficult to construct such buildings.

Maintenance

All buildings after their completion are handed over to the panchayats but they remain under the administrative control of the BDOs. It is the responsibility of the panchayat to maintain the buildings from their own funds. No provision has been made by the state government regarding annual maintenance of the buildings constructed

under this programme. Previously, the state government had given powers to the executive engineer (RES) for the technical sanction up to Rs. 10,000 for the repair of old works. Subsequently, in April 1985 the powers for special repairs were also given to assistant engineer (RES) and executive engineer (RES) for an amount of Rs. 1,500 and Rs. 5,000 respectively. The administrative approval for this amount is given by the collector in the case of the assistant engineer (RES) and by the divisional commissioner in case of the executive engineer. The problem of maintenance of old works is very acute in all the seven blocks. As there is no routine maintenance, the life of the building works is shortened to a considerable extent. In Durg district for the first time during 1984-85 an amount of Rs. 10,000 was given to each block for repair works. While in Raipur district no such grant was released from the inception of the programme up to June 1985. It is interesting to note that Dhamda and Balod blocks spent a considerable amount in the repair of school buildings during 1984-85 from the NREP funds. For the sake of illustration out of the total number of 38 works undertaken during 1984-85 in Dhamda block 15 works were of repair of school buildings. Similarly, in Balod block out of 36 works undertaken during 1984-85, 26 works were under the category of repair of school buildings. The total expenditure during 1984-85 in Balod block was Rs. four lakh and out of this Rs. 52,000 was spent in the repair works alone. We were also told by the BDO, Nagri that most of the repair works were undertaken from the tribal development grant. The BDO, Dondi block commented that under the NREP there are 200 buildings in the block and for their routine maintenance an amount of Rs. 50,000 is required annually. No funds are earmarked at the state level for the repairs. As a consequence some of the blocks are spending money from the NREP annual budget. The panchayats are not willing to spend money on the repairs. There is no clear cut policy regarding routine maintenance, leading to deterioration in the completed works which can result in non-use of buildings after few years. It has been estimated that there is a need to make a provision of at least three per cent of the cost of the buildings for the annual maintenance.

People's Participation

The gram panchayats are involved both in the planning and execution of this programme. But this programme does not entail from public any contribution in terms of cash or kind. There were certain isolated instances where through the contributions of the people in terms of cash and labour, the gram panchayats could construct more durable productive assets. In Pacherra Gram Panchayat of Dondi block, villagers constructed a tank which has increased the irrigated land area from 90 hectares to 250 hectares and has generated additional income approximately of Rs. 2,000 each to 75 cultivators. The contribution of the villagers in this scheme was approximately of Rs. one lakh. The grant under this scheme was only Rs. 42,000. Similarly, we came across in Saraipalli block a school building where the sarpanch contributed Rs. 5,000 and the villagers provided *Shramdan* (voluntary labour). Due to these reasons they could construct a more durable school building. Both these cases show that wherever the felt needs of the gram panchayats were taken up, the people voluntarily contributed in terms of cash and labour. This also signifies that rather than restricting the choice of the gram panchyats in terms of certain activities/ works it will be better if through the medium of gram sabha the decision regarding the works are taken up so as to reflect their genuine requirements and involvement.

Utilisation of Assets and Technical Design

There was non-utilisation of certain buildings like recreation hall and village secretariat complex constructed under the programme in some gram panchayats. In fact in one gram panchayat, Jhalmala,Balod block, Durg district, there was no occupancy of the village secretariat complex which was built two years back. Similarly, the recreation hall was also not much utilised. This calls for a need to go into the question of planning and designing of building works. Instead of recreation hall, school building, panchayat bhavan, balwadi bhavan, there is a need to design and plan an integrated functional complex. This requires a more innovative approach in the preparation of specifications and designs on the part of the technical personnel.

A number of sub-engineers also complained about defects in the specifications of the building works. It was pointed out in the design of school building, three supporters were required which were not shown in the specifications. It was also commented that the diameter of the well provided in the design is of six feet which is too small and does not enable many persons to use it simultaneously.

Information System

The analysis made in this chapter has amply shown that the existing system of monitoring is not at all effective. The three proformas monthly, quarterly and annual designed for the purpose of monitoring, totally fail to provide to the decision-makers at the district, state, the national levels the problems of this programme. In the proformas the emphasis is on the collection of information regarding the physical and financial targets. Due to this emphasis the decision-makers are not in a position to understand the problems relating to planning, implementation, release of grant, etc. We have already shown that the dysfunctionalities in the programme arise right from the planning stage, release of allotment (cash and kind), distribution of foodgrains, incomplete works, non-payment of wages to the workers, technical quality of works calculation of mandays, timing of works, completion of works, etc. These problems cannot be understood by the existing monitoring system. In this connection what is required is to have a firm idea about the critical indicators necessary in the planning and implementation of this programme and based on these indicators there is a need to develop, proformas so that the decision-makers at the district, state and national levels can take judicious decisions which will help in the effective control and implementation of the programme.

7

DISTRIBUTION OF FOODGRAINS

Under the programme as part of wages, one kg. foodgrains per manday has to be paid to the labourers. Up to February 1984, the foodgrains were distributed directly to the executing agencies. Since February 1984, there has been a change in procedure adopted for the distribution of foodgrains. The important aspects are given below:

—Foodgrains under the programme are provided by the development commissioner who also makes payment to the Food Corporation of India (FCI).

—Allotment for the district is made keeping in view the sanction/probable plan of works in the district.

—It is the responsibility of the collector to ensure that the foodgrains as required under the programme have been made available and the FCI possesses the stock according to the estimated demand prior to its requirement. The fair price shops, which are allotted their quota for distribution lift the foodgrains as needed and maintain its stock so that the distribution arrangement functions well.

—If there are no fair price shops conveniently available in the area where the foodgrains have to be distributed, village panchayat can be declared a fair price shop by the colllector in its area for the purpose of this scheme. In such a case foodgrains can be obtained for distribution from the base depot of the FCI directly or from the Lead Society and can be distributed to the labourers against coupons.

—It is also the responsibility of the collector to allot quota to the fair price shops and other distributing agencies according to the requirement of foodgrains in their areas. The collector will also arrange for payment to these organisations for the expenses incurred by them in distribution and their commission at a rate per quintal decided in consultation with the development commissioner.

Since June 1984, it has been decided to distribute foodgrains at subsidised rates. The cost of wheat has been fixed at Rs. 1.50 per kg. and that of coarse rice at Rs. 1.85 per kg. In order to ensure that the subsidised grain reaches the labourers with effect from February 1984, the distribution of foodgrains is organised only through coupons. It is also the responsibility of the collector to make available the coupons for as many kgs. of foodgrains as are required on the basis of estimated mandays of labour alongwith the financial allotment. The foodgrains coupons are issued to the DRDA by the development commissioner. The DRDA keeps account of foodgrains lifted, distributed, number of bags, their disposal, etc. The coupons received are sorted out workwise and separate account of each work is kept. The DRDA has also the responsibility to assess the quantity of foodgrains available with the distributors and their requirements. The foodgrains coupons have to be accounted for and dealt with in the same manner as the cash. At the time of the payment of wages to the labourers, recovery has to be effected from their wages for the cost of foodgrains.

On the basis of allotment released, the DRDA allocate foodgrains to the executing agencies. The work of lifting and transporting the foodgrains to the fair price shops of the concerned area is done through the medium of lead cooperative marketing societies. In Raipur and Durg districts, almost in all blocks these lead societies are operating. The permit to lift and transport the foodgrains with a list of fair price shops and quantity allotted to such shops is given by the executing agencies to the lead societies. The lead societies are paid at the rate of Rs. 10 per quintal and the link

societies are given Rs. three as commission per quintal *plus* the empty bag.

In Raipur district from May 1985, a slightly different procedure is adopted for distribution of foodgrains. The executing agencies put their demand for foodgrains in the beginning of the financial year. These executing agencies while assessing the requirement of foodgrains keep in mind the number of works to be executed and also the mandays likely to be generated in a year. The demand of the executing agencies also include the list of fair price shops and the quantity required in each shop in their area alongwith the monthly requirement also. On the basis of allotment received from the DRDA and the demands from executing agencies the sub-divisional officer (civil) issue permit to the manager, marketing society to lift and transport the foodgrains alongwith the list of fair price shops and the quantity required in each fair price shop. It is the responsibility of the marketing society to look into the quality of the foodgrains and collect a sealed sample of the same from the FCI. It is the duty of the sub-divisional officer (civil) to ensure that the foodgrains are transported within a week from the date of issue of permit.

In order to assess the distribution of foodgrains to the labourers, Table 7.1 shows by way of illustration foodgrains component allotted to the works undertaken in Dondi block, Durg district during 1984-85. It is evident from Table 7.1 that there was no synchronisation in the release of cash instalments and foodgrains component. As a result of this, some labourers either received both, *i.e.*, cash and foodgrains or cash only. But in majority of the cases the labourers received only cash component. It is also evident from the table that the release of foodgrains component was not commensurate with the requirement. As such one of the important requirements of this programme, *i.e.*, distribution of one kg. of foodgrains for each manday was not fulfilled. This position is more or less the same in all the seven blocks and other agencies like PWD, forestry, etc. Regarding the payment of wages, we interviewed 200 labourers in the panchayat, social forestry and PWD sectors. Table 7.2 shows

that out of 200 labourers of the sample only 42.5 per cent received their wages fully in cash, 25 per cent received part payment in cash and were assured of foodgrains later on. In case of 32.5 per cent no payments were made either in cash or foodgrains but these labourers were promised to be paid in foodgrains later on. In some of the works surveyed in Nagri and Mainpur blocks of Raipur district and Dhamda block of Durg district, no payment either in cash or in kind was made to the labourers for a duration varying between three to four weeks. In case of Nagri and Mainpur blocks as the cash allotment given to the individual works was exhausted and foodgrains component did not reach the fair price shops the labourers were not paid. While in case of works of Dhamda block only cash component was paid to the labourers and they were assured of the foodgrains component in due course of time. This analysis of foodgrains distribution during 1984-85 and the first quarter of financial year 1985-86 leads to some very important questions regarding why this happens? Before analysing the problems in the distibution of food grains it is important to mention that all the labourers of the sample were keen to have a part of wages paid in kind. The reason being that foodgrains are given on subisidised rates.

The major problems in the distribution of foodgrains to the labourers arise due to the following reasons:

1. Firstly, at the time of preparation of the annual action plan the mandays calculated against each work are not realistic. As a result, the quota of allotment of foodgrains made by the office of the development commissioner and by the DRDA is not scientifically determined.

2. Secondly, there is no synchronisation in the allocation of cash and foodgrains at all the levels—state, district, block and the work site. For example, dates of cash and foodgrains instalments released by the DRDAs of Durg and Raipur districts during the first

quarter of the financial year 1985-86 are shown below:

District	*Cash Instalments*		*Foodgrains Instalments*	
	First Instalment (Rs. lakh)	*Second Instalment (Rs. lakh)*	*Qty (in mt.)*	*Date*
Raipur	28.22 (April 1985)	32.68 (May 1985)	400	(May 1985)
Durg	35.80 (April-May 1985)		150	(May 1985)
			140	(May 1985)

This discrepancy in the timing of release of the cash and foodgrains instalments leads to a situation where the works are immediately taken up as there is no manpower plan in terms of workers to be employed and the number of days the work will last, specially in earth works, there is a quick utilisation of funds. The period for completion of such works varied between one week to four weeks for the works valuing Rs. 5,000 to Rs. 50,000. As a consequence of this, the number of labourers employed in such works were also very high. Another important reason for quick completion of earth works is the fact the BDOs as well as the sarpanchs are keen to get such works completed before the onset of monsoon. This fact has also to be seen in conjunction with the discretion that a BDO has for the release of instalments in a particular work. This problem coupled with the delay in the distribution of foodgrains to the fair price shops, result in either the labourers being given their wages in cash or they are penalised in some cases where the cash allotment has been exhausted.

An important question in the distribution of foodgrains is the procedure adopted in its lifting and subsequent distribution. In this connection, we have been told by officials of the DRDA of both the districts that from the date of issue of release letter from the office of the development commissioner to its distribution to the executing agencies by the DRDA takes almost three to four weeks. For example, in the case of Durg district, the office of the development commissioner

informed the DRDA on May 6, 1985 about the release of foodgrains but the allotment letter was actually received by the DRDA on May 14, 1985. In turn the DRDA, gave the release order to the District Cooperative Marketing Society on May 21, 1985. The District Cooperative Marketing Society, Durg district informed the DRDA on June 17, 1985 about the lifting of foodgrains and its transportation to various fair price shops as desired by the DRDA.

Similarly, in case of Raipur district, on receipt of allotment of 400 MT of rice, the DRDA allotted to various executing agencies the foodgrains on May 24, 1985 only. The details of this distribution is given in Table 7.3 which shows the quantity allotted to the executing agencies and the total quantity of foodgrains allotted to the concerned sub-divisional officer (civil). On the basis of this allotment on June 3, 1985, the district Manager, FCI, Raipur district, informed the DRDA about the stock position of raw rice available in its base centres. It is evident from Table 7.4 that raw rice was available only at four base centres, *i.e.*, Raipur I, Raipur II, Rajim and Dhamtari, while the requirement was also from Bhatapara and Mahasamund. Table 7.4 also shows that at Rajim and Dhamtari base centres of FCI the stock was less than the quantity required. In view of the stock position and in order to avoid excess expenditure in lifting and transportation, it was decided by the chief executive officer, DRDA in consultation with FCI to revise the centre-wise allotment of foodgrains. This revised allotment was done on June 6, 1985 and is shown in Table 7.5. On the basis of the revised allotment, sub-divisional officer (civil), Dhamtari, issued permit to lead society for the collection of foodgrains by June 1985. But the base centre of the FCI at Dhamtari conveyed to this lead society that they have not received any communication regarding allotment from the district office of the FCI. The sub-divisonal officer, Dhamtari, also informed the collector on June 10, 1985 that although 60 MT rice has been allotted to the sub-division on May 24, 1985 but they have not been able to collect this allotment. As a consequence of this, no foodgrains were allotted to the executing agencies up to June 30, 1985. In order to understand the problem we discussed this matter with the

assistant manager (storage), FCI, Raipur on June 26, 1985. It was told by the Office of the assistant manager (storage), that the final letter could not be sent promptly to the base-depot as the concerned official was busy.

The above analysis of the procedure and processes adopted in the distribution of foodgrains clearly shows lack of coordination between the DRDA and the FCI and sheer indifference on the part of the FCI in promptly issuing the orders. It also shows that it has almost taken seven weeks from the date of issue of letter from the office of the development commissioner and yet the foodgrains were not transported to the fair price shops.

The other processes which are required in the distribution of foodgrains relate to the issue of coupons to the executing agencies and collection of foodgrains by the labourers from the fair price shops. It was told by the BDOs that sometimes the coupons were also not available at the DRDA. Besides, the BDOs and the labourers also complained that the fair price shops are at a distance of two to five kilometres and these shops open two-three days in a week due to the paucity of staff.

The other related question concerns the problems faced by the fair price shops in keeping the stocks of foodgrains for a long time. For example, as on April 1985 various fair price shops in Raipur district had 2,447 quintal foodgrains in their stocks which was exclusively meant for the NREP works during the financial year 1984-85. As pointed out earlier these societies received the foodgrains only during last week of June 1984 and by the time most of the earth works were completed and consequently there was no demand for foodgrains as the labourers were fully paid their wages in cash. It has also to be mentioned that most of the works undertaken during the first quarter of the financial year were earth works and comparatively demand for the foodgrains was also very high during this period. Later on, the works undertaken are building works and their completion takes comparatively longer time varying between three months to one year and the materials component is also high leading to a situation where the foodgrains demand is not only less but it

also depends on the promptness in the release of cash instalments to the works. As a consequence of erratic nature of demand for foodgrains, fair price shop have to keep the stock of allotment separately as well as blocking their godowns for a longer duration. This in turn upset their other activities like storage of fertilizer, seeds, etc. Another related question is the state government's policy of doing away with the technical sanction since 1984 and only administrative sanction is required for the works. As a result of this under the financial powers given to the BDOs and sub-divisonal officers (SDO) to sanction works up to Rs. 15,000 and Rs. 25,000 respectively, a number of works were taken up. As a consequence of this in a district like Raipur, where this practice has been adopted by the collector and the concerned officials like district development officer (DDO), chief executive officer, DRDA were not at all aware of the type of works undertaken by the blocks, except that they were included in the annual action plan. In Baghbahara block, Raipur district, the entire amount of first instalment of Rs. 1.50 lakh (during April, 1985 to June 30, 1985) was spent only in such type of works. In Durg district there is a better control over the works as both technical and administrative sanction are required for works valuing any amount.

This analysis shows that there is a need to change the existing system of distribution of foodgrains as there is no inter-relationship between the release of cash and foodgrains instalments, type of works undertaken, release of instalments to individual works, number of labourers employed at work sites, etc., and as a consequence, these inter-related factors do not move in tandem. In order to ensure the distribution of foodgrains to labourers there is a need to take certain steps both at the state and district levels:

- The state government should ensure that the cash and foodgrains components are released simultaneously.

- At the DRDA level, it should be ensured that the foodgrains component is lifted and transported to

the fair price shops before the release of cash component.

— For a realistic assessment of the requirement of the foodgrains both in the new and incomplete works it is essential for the DRDA to know from the executing agencies regarding the type of works to be undertaken, date of commencement, tentative time for completion of works, number of workers to be engaged daily, mandays likely to be generated, etc.

8

IMPACT OF THE PROGRAMME

The purpose of this chapter is to assess the impact of the programme, broadly in terms of employment generation, incomes and benefits from the assets created. In order to appreciate the impact of the programme on employment generation it is important first to have an overview of the labour force characteristics in both the districts. It has been estimated that more than 70 per cent of the rural population in Durg and Raipur districts are below the poverty line. Both the districts are characterised by a high percentage of monocrop area. Besides the average yield per hectare is less than the average of the state. As such, even the cultivators belonging to the category of small and marginal farmers are no better than the landless agricultural labourers. In the absence of any significant industrial development in these districts a large percentage of the rural population is dependent on agriculture. The landless labourers barely get employment for two to three months in agriculture. Due to these factors the prevailing wage rate is very low. Under agricultural operations most of the labourers are paid in kind equivalent to Rs. four to Rs. six per day. In fact, in Raipur district in some of the blocks like Baghbahara and Saraipalli we found the existence of bonded labour system. Due to the non-availability of work, by and large, agricultural labourers are willing to work mostly during off seasons for very low wages. There is a high incidence of indebtedness also. In order to survive, the usual practice of landless labour (particularly in Raipur district) is to take loan mostly in kind and return one and half to two times of that amount after a period of four to six months. There is a high mobility of the agricultural labourers to other states for seasonal jobs. Other employment avenues are works

undertaken by agencies like irrigation, soil conservation, public works, forestry, etc.

In order to assess the impact of the programme 200 labourers engaged in the on-going works of all categories spread over in the seven blocks were interviewed.

Caste and Land Holding Pattern

Table 8.1 shows that out of the sample, 72.5 per cent beneficiaries were from STs and 25 per cent from SCs. This was due to high percentage of STs and SCs population in both the districts.

Table 8.2 shows that out of the sample, 62.5 per cent beneficiaries were landless and 27.5 per cent were having landholding less than five acres and 10 per cent having landholding between five to 10 acres. In terms of distribution of labourers by sex, Table 8.3 shows that 65.5 per cent beneficiaries were male, 30 per cent female and 4.5 per cent in the category of children.

Employment

Before analysing the employment provided under the programme, it is important to keep in mind the distinction that, by and large, earth works are completed in one spurt while building works linger on for a period varying between two months to one year. It is evident from Table 8.4 that out of the sample, one week employment was provided to five per cent beneficiaries, between one to two weeks to 40 per cent, two to three weeks to 30 per cent and up to four weeks to 22.5 per cent beneficiaries. In the building work the beneficiaries of the sample, by and large, did not get employment for more than one week at a time. This is due to the allotment problem and as a consequence earthworks were taken in different periods resulting in the change of composition of labourers. The labourers getting employment between two to four weeks were mostly from earth works like road, tank deepening, social forestry, etc. One fact which we want to emphasise, relates to the total inadequacy of employment generated under the programme in comparison to the rate of unemployment. This is not surprising because the percentage of poverty is very high, coupled with

the meagre allotment at the block level which varied between Rs. five lakh to Rs. eight lakh in a year, as such employment generated at the individual work site level was very low. There is a limit in the panchayat sector of not taking works more than Rs. 50,000. There was a high turn-out of labourers in earth works varying between 200 to 500 per day resulting in a situation where such works were completed in a very short time.

The works under the programme were very attractive from the point of view of short term employment. For example, in case of Kodia gram panchayat, Dhamda block, the beneficiaries forced the sarpanch not to employ any person from outside the village. But in Sikripalli gram panchayat, Baghbahara block, the labourers of the village especially of the pockets where a well was under construction, were denied the jobs. We have also been told that if the labour turn-out was very high, the work was closed for a short period to avoid the workers. There was no system of registration of workers in Raipur and Durg districts. In the building works, because the number of mandays generated were not very high, we came across many perplexing situations. For example, gram panchayat of Chariguddi of Balod block, the mason brought his own gang, while in Guchapalli gram panchayat, Saraipalli block the sarpanch did not allow the labourers of the village to work and brought workers from different village of the same gram panchayat. Due to the size of works undertaken coupled with the socio-economic characteristics of the labour force there was no impact of the programme on the supply and demand of labour in agricultural operations.

Incomes and Wages

On the basis of the number of days employment provided, we calculated pattern of change in income levels of the beneficiaries of the sample. The income generated from this programme varied between Rs. 28 to Rs. 112 per beneficiary in a year. We have already pointed out that none of the beneficiaries got employment in previous years under the programme. As such change in income levels of the beneficiaries have been neglegible.

Regarding the payment of wages to beneficiaries both in cash and kind it was already mentioned (in previous chapter, Table 7.2) that out of the sample, 42.5 per cent received only cash and 25 per cent both cash and foodgrains and in case of 32.5 per cent workers no payments were made for the duration varying between three to four weeks. In 67.5 per cent cases where the payments were made, the periodicity of payment varied between one to two weeks. A major problem regarding the timely payment was due to the lack of planning of works and delay in the release of funds. It is also very relevant to mention that in earth works payments were made on piece rate basis. The beneficiaries commented that in piece rate basis measurements were not correctly taken and they were paid less.

Assets

Most of the works which have been undertaken since the inception of the programme, have been broadly in the category of community based asset like road, tank deepening, well, school, community centres, panchayat bhavan, etc. Almost 50 per cent funds in both the districts had gone for earth works like kuccha roads and tank deepening. It is evident that not much emphasis has been given to productive type of works like minor irrigation, drainage, land reclamation, etc. Due to the nature of the works undertaken, there is no direct benefit to the weaker sections in income generation, employment pattern, etc. There are very few cases in both the district where productive works were undertaken. In Dondi block, we saw that through people's participation a lift irrigation work which resulted in substantive increase in the incomes of the beneficiaries. No emphasis has been given in understanding the felt needs of the area resulting in similiar activities being undertaken year after year. The creation of community based assets like school, community hall, etc., have resulted in giving limited benefit to the rural poor.

9

MAJOR FINDINGS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The National Rural Employment Programme (NREP) was started in October 1980 with a view to generate additional gainful employment for the unemployed and under-employed persons in the rural areas, creation of durable community assets for strengthening the rural infrastructure so as to raise the income levels of the rural poor and for the improvement of the nutritional status and the living standard of the rural poor.

The present study was undertaken in Durg and Raipur districts of Madhya Pradesh. The objectives of the study were:

1. to provide an analysis of the processes involved in the implementation of the programme;
2. to provide an evaluation of the processes and methods adopted and to gauge how far they proved effective in achieving the desired objectives;
3. to provide an analysis of the factors which are critical for the success of the programme;
4. to gauge the extent to which the relevant agencies played the role envisaged by them as well as the effectiveness of the administrative set-up, particularly of the DRDA, and RES, etc., in the implementation of the programme;
5. to study the contribution of the programme in the creation of durable community assets for augmenting the production potential and economic infrastructure of the area;
6. to assess the extent of additional employment generated in the rural areas and the change in the income levels of the beneficiaries; and

7. to investigate distributive aspects of the programme, *i.e.*, the actual short and long terms benefits at the different levels of the village community.

Basically, in this study, the emphasis was on examining the micro-level problems in the implementation of the programme. For the purpose of this study seven blocks in the Raipur and Durg districts were selected. Adequate emphasis was given in the selection of the districts and blocks on the variables like cash fund utilisation, employment generation, foodgrains distribution and assets creation. Weightage was also given to significant socio-economic indicators like the percentage of scheduled castes and scheduled tribes, development of agriculture, the percentage of people below the poverty line, etc. In order to understand the problems of implementation, 42 on-going works were selected. To assess the impact of the programme, 200 beneficiaries engaged in almost all significant type of works were interviewed.

Planning of Works

The study reveals that some of the problems confronted at the planning level are due to the instructions issued by the state government. The basic purpose of this programme is the creation of durable assets based on the felt needs of the people. But the directives issued by the state government had tied-down the programme to certain activities, like rural roads, school building, nistar tank, panchayat bhavan, drinking water well, etc. There was, therefore, no scope for undertaking any systematic assessment and survey of the felt needs of the people. This is a by-product of top down centralised planning and is also due to multiplicity of programme objectives. This has resulted in a situation where almost similar type of activities are taken year after year which do not reflect the felt needs of the target groups.

In case of the preparation of the shelf of projects, both three yearly and five yearly projects were prepared in both the districts during 1981-82 and 1983-84. But in actual practice the annual action plan did not bear any semblance to the shelf of projects. To that extent, the preparation of the shelf of projects have become a futile exercise. Also, not

much concern has been shown to actual financial allocations in the preparation of the projects. So much so the shelf of projects prepared at the block level have been bloated three or four times more than the average of the allocations made during the last five years.

Due to the directives of the state government, demands which came from the gram panchayats, could not take into account the felt needs of the rural poor. Because of the mechanism which have to be adopted at the block level in the preparation of the annual action plan, the whole exercise has become politicised, resulting in the number of works proposed in the annual action plan bearing no semblance to the anticipated grants. In most of the blocks surveyed, in fact, there was a violation of the directive of the state government that, in preparing annual action plans, they should not exceed the previous grant by more than 25 per cent. The role of the DRDA has been very minimal. It just approves the annual action plan prepared by the BDOs on the recommendation of the Janpad. The DRDA neither scrutinises these annual action plans nor does it have any inventory of the assets created in different gram panchayats of the blocks, so as to take effective corrective measures at the time of the annual plan approval.

It is also important to mention that in Durg district the annual action plan for the year 1985-86 was approved in May 1985 while in Raipur district the plan was not approved till July 15, 1985. But in Baghbahara block of this district, 18 new works which required the sanction of BDO and SDO costing Rs. 1.50 lakh were taken up. In fact, taking works like this was a clear violation of the state governments directive that new works can only be taken when the annual action plan is approved by the governing board of the DRDA. Besides, it has been directed by the state government that the first instalment of the grant in the completion be spent on the incomplete works of the previous years. But not only in Baghbahara block but in other blocks as well not much attention was given to the completion of the incom- plete works. It has been pointed out by most of the BDOs that due to political compulsions, the annual action plan

was prepared of much bigger magnitude ignoring the instructions of the state government. As a consequence of this, a large number of works were opened up to satisfy the leaders of the gram panchayats without looking into the financial constraints, and thus leading to division of meagre resources into various works without any hope of their completion in a reasonable period of time.

Social Forestry

With regard to social forestry works 20 per cent of the allocations in both the districts have been made for the last two to three years. In both the districts social forestry works were concentrated in few pockets only. Secondly, in the distribution of free saplings to the rural poor, the survival rate was very low because forest department did not provide any saplings (fruit bearing or of commercial use) to the beneficiaries. Similarly in Panchavan scheme which started only during 1984-85, it was commented by the villagers that there was not much involvement of the community in such works because their views were not taken on the type of species to be planted in the Panchavans. Due to the indifference of the villagers to the scheme, the social forestry agencies are also facing a lot of problems in the maintenance of the saplings.

Rural Roads

Similarly as directed by the state government, in both the districts, 10 per cent of the allocations were earmarked for rural roads. Up to March 1984, the collectors made the allocations dividing this amount equally among the different Legislative Assembly constituencies. Later on, this criteria was replaced by a new set of rules according to which the decision regarding the locations of the roads are taken by the collector, in consultation with the local MLAs. In the planning of these works, the role of the DRDA is totally insignificant. Neither it is in a position to evaluate the schemes submitted by the executive engineers nor to assess the completed works. We have also seen that primarily in Durg district and to some extent in Raipur district that most of the works undertaken during 1984-85, were located in the

pockets where during relief operations some work had already been done. Though it is stipulated in the central guidelines to make fully metal roads, in many cases, neither was there a proper survey nor were bridges and culverts constructed.

Incomplete Works

The size of the annual action plan did not bear any relationship to the financial allocations, leading to the opening of a large number of works and as a consequence a number of works remained incomplete. This problem is increasing year after year. The number of incomplete works in Durg and Raipur districts were 328 and 875 respectively up to April 1985. These figures relate to the panchayat sector alone.

It has been estimated that the amount required for the completion of incomplete works would be to the tune of Rs. 10.5 lakh and Rs. 30.15 lakh in Raipur and Durg districts respectively which is 66 and 22 per cent of the annual allocations of these districts. In fact in each and every block surveyed the number of incomplete works is increasing year after year. For example, in Baghbahara block in April 1984, the number of incomplete works were 27 while in April 1985 the number rose to 29; during the same period in Saraipalli block the number of incomplete works rose from 43 to 46 and in Mainpur block from 17 to 31.

It is important to mention that the grant given to the blocks under the programme is block grant. This means that the BDO has the discretion to allocate the grant both in the new and incomplete works. In fact once the annual action plan is approved and the instalments are released there is practically no control over the BDO by the higher authorities. Under the delegation of powers of sanction given to the BDO and SDO it is only in the case of sanction for more than Rs. 25,000 to Rs. 50,000 that they need the administrative sanction of the collector. In Durg district, however, there has been a better control as all the works, irrespective of cost, have necessarily to be approved both for technical and administrative sanction by the competent authorities. As a consequence of this, at least in Raipur district, the

DDO and collector were not at all aware of the field situation, especially in cases where sanction power rests with the BDO and SDO. On an average in the blocks surveyed, the works completed during 1984-85 were one-third of the total number of works, *i.e.*, new and incomplete works of the previous years. In such a situation, it is difficult to supervise the works and make correct assessment of the problems. The state government should impose a total ban on all the new proposals specially in those blocks where their numbers are large. In case of new proposals, there is a need to make completion of works compulsory during the financial year.

Allocation Criteria, Allotment and Release of Funds

The Government of India releases its quantum of finance under the programme on the basis of number of agricultural workers, marginal farmers and the incidence of poverty. The state government on the other hand up to 1984-85 allocated the grant on the basis of population. According to this criteria, in blocks where the population was more than 75,000 an amount of Rs. 5.65 lakh was allocated and in the blocks where the population was less than 75,000, an amount of Rs. 4.50 lakh was allocated. From 1985-86 there has been a change in this criteria and now under the panchayat sector the quantum of finance is released on the basis of the weightage to the number of agricultural workers, marginal farmers and incidence of rural poverty. Related to this problem is the release of instalments to various agencies and blocks. During 1984-85 in both the blocks, the state government released the grants to the DRDAs in 10 to 15 instalments. Subsequently, the DRDAs released this amount to the blocks in six to seven instalments. There was also a problem of encashment of the grant by the blocks from the banks which took roughly one to one and a-half months. The quantum of instalments to various agencies and blocks depends not only on the availability of funds from the state government, but also on the discretion of the collector was determines the quantum of instalments. Timely release of grant is the major problem in the completion of works.

From 1980-81 to 1984-85 in the panchayat sector in both the districts, 50 per cent works were undertaken under the broad category of earth works and approximately 55 to 60 per cent allotment in both the districts were given to the panchayat sector. Allotment to Forest Department was 15 per cent of the total grant in both the districts while allotment given to the PWD was 27 and 11 per cent in Raipur and Durg districts respectively.

Materials and Wage Ratio

The Government of India guidelines of NREP mentions that the ratio of material and wage should be 50:50 for a district as a whole. It is on the basis of ratio that the blocks while preparing the annual action plan calculate the mandays in various works. In building works, the estimates of mandays were grossly inflated. Secondly, there is no distinction made at present between the employment generated for the skilled and unskilled workers. It is common knowledge that a large chunk of the grant goes to the skilled workers primarily in building works. There is also a related problem in earth works where there is no manpower budgeting regarding the number of persons employed in such works, leading to a situation where works to the value of even Rs. 50,000 were completed within a period of one week to two weeks. In earth works the wages were given on piece-rate basis. The workers complained that the measurements were not taken correctly.

Non-utilisation of Assets

There was also non-utilisation of certain buildings works like secretariat complex and manoranjan bhawan, etc. It was also commented by the RES engineers that in some cases the specifications and the drawings given by the office of the Development Commissioner were defective.

Implementation

In a case study of Dondi block, Durg district it was revealed that since the inception of the programme 34.91 per cent of the allocation was spent in school building works and 48 per cent of the allocation was spent on approach roads

and tanks. Similarly, there was also discrepancy in terms of allotment made to various gram panchayats and over a period of last five years, out of 43 gram panchayats, 14 gram panchayats received allotment amounts varying from Rs. 1.20 lakh to Rs. 2.40 lakh while in 29 gram panchayats, this amount was between Rs. 40,000 to Rs. 1,20,000. Similarly, in eight gram panchayats, the number of works undertaken were 8 to 12, while in other gram panchayats the number varied between one to six since the inception of the programme. In 18 gram panchayats there were two or more school buildings constructed. This shows there was repetition of similar type of works in the same gram panchayat. On an average 50 to 60 per cent of the expenditure was incurred only in school building in these gram panchayats. This also shows that DRDA does not take into account at the time of approval of annual action plan the assets created under the programme. In the absence of the information regarding the assets created, DRDA is not in a position to question the inclusion of such works at the time of approval of the annual action plan; it merely serves as a body which puts a rubber stamp on the annual action plans prepared by the blocks. Analysis of the assets created in some gram panchayats of Dondi block since 1980-81 to 1984-85 have amply shown the defused focus of the programme, the multiplicity of objectives, priorities arbitrarily set up by the state government, mechanism adopted for the preparation of annual action plan and the financial constraint of not taking the works of more than Rs. 50,000 in panchayat sector, has made the programme to some extent irrelevant. For example, in a Gram Panchayat in Dhamda block although approximately, Rs. three lakh has been spent under this programme, acute need of the entire village for drinking water has not been fulfilled. This is not an isolated example, such problems are being confronted in almost all the gram panchayats.

In some blocks, instalments were not released according to the norms laid-down for their disbursement. This curtailment in the norms led to delay in the completion of the works and as a result, in building works, different sets of labourers were engaged for different spells of time spread

over a period of one year or even more. We also noticed valuation of the building works as shown in measurement book varied from one day to one week before the date of release of instalment. This is done primarily to show that works lingered on from the release of the previous instalment to the release of next instalment. In fact, valuation is normally conducted only when the funds are available at the block level. Roads which are built under the Panchayat sector are kuccha roads and in the construction of these roads no survey was conducted and there was no provision of culverts and hume pipes, etc. Due to this reason the work had to be stopped sometimes. Also, on the same work, money was spent in subsequent years on the construction of culverts and laying of hume pipes. The roads constructed are neither durable nor serve the purpose round the year. In fact, roads constructed under the panchayat sector violate all the norms as stipulated in the central guidelines. Similarly, in case of works relating to tank deepening, extension and rejuvenation, the cost estimates vary from Rs. 5,000 to Rs. 50,000. The cost estimates are prepared more on the basis of the availability of funds than on any survey. Approximately, 15 to 20 per cent of the money under this programme is being spent in tank deepening alone. Another important point is that the earth works mostly commence in the months of May and June. It is common knowledge that the monsoon commence in both the districts by the early June. No attention is, therefore, paid to the timing of such works. With the commencement of the monsoon, it is also difficult to make proper measurement of the works.

An important assumption in this programme is to take up the work in the off season but the manner in which grants were disbursed from the DRDA to the block office and from the block office to the individual works makes it difficult for this to take place. In fact, in some of the blocks like Nagri, Balod and Mainpur during 1984-85, two-third of the grant was released during the last quarter of the financial year. This is also true in the case of works undertaken by public works and other departments. It is important to note here that during this last quarter allotment, emphasis was not

given for the completion of incomplete works but new works were opened up under both panchayat and PWD sectors.

Recovery

There were many cases of recovery in the blocks surveyed. This problem arises because either the sanctioned amount has not been utilised or less work has been executed in relation to the grant released. In Saraipalli block, there were as many as 16 cases of recovery worth Rs. 33,418, Nagri block 30 cases of recovery, Mainpur block there were three cases of recovery of Rs. 40,000 and in Dondi block there was one case of recovery of the value of Rs. 12,000. Except in Balod block, in no other block recovery orders were issued. The main reason for this was political interference with regard to the issue of the recovery orders.

Technical Supervision

The sub-engineers are expected to supervise the works in the panchayat sector. Most of the sarpanchs in the works surveyed commented that the visits of the sub-engineers were very few so much so that in almost all the blocks earth works were completed without any technical assistance rendered by them. As a consequence of this, valuation did not take place at an appropriate time resulting in delay in the release of instalments and affecting progress of works. It was also commented by the sarpanchs that they had to visit the block office a number of times to request the sub-engineer and BDO to visit work sites for valuation and technical guidance. This problem is becoming more pronounced since April, 1984 when the state government has taken away from the assistant engineer (RES), the powers to assess 10 per cent of the works in block. As such not only the final valuation rests with the sub-engineer but there is no control over the sub-engineers by the assistant engineer. In comparison to Raipur, in Durg district where the collector has not taken away the powers of the assistant engineer to supervise 10 per cent of the works, there is more effective control. Another related issue is the workload on a sub-engineer. On an average in a block there are not more than

12 to 16 works in a year. As such in a year one sub-engineer (two sub-engineers are posted in each block) supervise six to eight works. The state government in April 1984 established a Nirman Samiti to supervise the work at the gram panchayat level. These committees are not functioning at all. The main reason for this is that the BDOs do not want to share the powers with the members of the Nirman Samiti. It is important to emphasise here that Rs. two crore to Rs. 2.5 crore are being spent every year on RES in the state but in terms of workload and responsibilities, this service has not contributed much in the existing set-up. The type of construction which is taking place in the panchayat sector especially in building works is technically or inferior quality, although the cost estimates are based on the Current Schedule of Rate. This is because the sub-engineers are not visiting the work-site as and when required and as prescribed in the directives. The state government's directive to utilise the indigenous material in the constru ction work has not been adhered to at all.

Maintenance of the Assets

There is no provision for annual maintenance of the buildings. As such, buildings become not only weak but unfit for utilisation within a period of five to six years. In Durg district for the first time during 1984-85, an amount of Rs. 10,000 was given to each block for repair while in Raipur district no such grant was released up to June 1985. In this connection it is interesting to note that in Dhamda and Balod blocks of Durg district during 1984-85, a considerable amount of money was spent in the repair of school buildings from the NREP funds. This is a clear violation of the norms governing the programme.

Distribution of Foodgrains

Under the programme, one kg. of foodgrains per man-day have to be paid to the labourers along with cash com-ponent. In all the blocks surveyed we have seen that this provision was not at all adhered to. There were very few cases in all the works surveyed where the workers got their payments both in cash and in kind. The major problems in

the distribution of foodgrains arise due to the following reasons:

1. at the time of preparation of annual action plan the mandays calculated against each work were not realistic. As a result, the quota of allotment made by the office of the development commissioner and by the DRDA was not scientifically determined.
2. there was no synchronisation in the allocation of cash and foodgrains at all the levels, *i.e.*, state, district, block and work-site.

As important question in the distribution of foodgrains is the procedure adopted in its lifting and distribution. From the date of issue of release letter from the office of the development commissioner to the distribution to various executing agencies by the DRDA, almost three to four weeks clapse. Besides there was also lack of coordination between DRDA and Food Corporation of India. The distributing agencies were also facing a number of problems concerning storage as the foodgrains were not lifted by the blocks and other agencies in time. There is a need to change the existing system of distribution of foodgrains as there is no inter-relationship between release of cash and foodgrains instalments and the type of works undertaken, the release of instalments to individual works, number of workers employed at various work-site, etc. The beneficiaries of the sample were very keen to have a part of their wages in kind as the foodgrains are given at subsidised rates.

Information System

The existing system of monitoring is not at all effective. The emphasis in the information system is on the collection of data regarding the physical and financial targets. In order to be effective, the information system should include those critical indicators which are necessary in the planning and implementation of this programme.

Administrative Dysfunctionalities

We have already analysed at appropriate places in the

preceding chapters the various institutional mechanisms devised for the purpose of planning of works, administrative sanction of works, release of grant, technical and administrative supervision and control. We have also mentioned the dysfunctionalities in all these processes. This brings us to a very crucial question that despite a very elaborate organisational structure created right from the work-site level to the district level all these dysfunctionalities occur. In passing we must also mention that this programme except for Social Forestry and PWD sectors is decentralised in the sense that they are implemented by the Panchayati Raj Institutions. For supervision, control and monitoring the state government from time to time have issued elaborate instructions. But we have seen that these instructions are not helpful in achieving the purpose. There are many shortcomings both from the point of view of administrative arrangements made as well as due to lack of proper supervision and review of this programme. We are analysing below some of the important contributing factors.

At the district level both District Rural Development Agency (DRDA) and District Development Officer (DDO) are performing almost similar type of functions. Though, it is expected from the DRDA to plan, supervise and review this programme, in practice we have seen that right from the planning stage to its implementation and monitoring including review, its role is very minimal. In planning process it just acts as a rubber stamp for approving the shelf of projects and annual action plans submitted by the block and other sectoral agencies. Though, there are directives from the state government to see that shelf of projects and annual action plan are not prepared for more than 25 per cent of the grant of the preceding year, the DRDA does not at all look into these important directives at the time of the approval of annual action plan and shelf of projects. Secondly, it is expected from the DRDA to have an inventory of the assets created under the programme since its inception so that at the time of the approval of the annual action plan, it can make meaningful intervation to include areas which were neglected and which have the incidence of bonded labour or low wage pockets, etc.

As a consequence of this lack of scrutiny by the DRDA at the time of approval of annual action plan, we have observed that in most of the blocks surveyed there are some panchayats which were much more benefited in terms of resource allocation. In fact, in the last few years there have been instances in Nagri, Mainpur, Saraipalli and Baghbahara blocks of the Raipur district where even the works not approved in the annual action plan were taken up due to political compulsions. In the absence of any scrutiny, the DRDA is not in a position to oversee that in all the gram panchayats, resources are, by and large, equally distributed over a period of five years if not less. At the block level, the role of the BDO is limited to earmarking of 10 per cent of resources to works exclusively for the benefit of the SCs and STs. This has resulted, as already mentioned in the previous pages, in the repetition of similar type of activities in the gram panchayats, concentration of works in some gram panchayats and no systematic examination of the felt needs of the people, especially the rural poor. Similarly, at the time of inclusion of the works in the annual action plan at the block level, there is hardly any systematic examination of the cost estimates of earth works especially tank deepening, etc. The DRDA does not scrutinise the schemes of PWD, irrigation, social forestry sectors especially in relation to cost estimates. The DRDA does not have any competence to get these estimates examined before approving the annual action plan. It is important to keep in mind that some of the works undertaken during last year in the PWD sector were located in those pockets in which already earth works in terms of collection of stone, etc., was already done under previous scarcity programmes. In fact, there is a need for the DRDA to evaluate the cost estimates given by the PWD, forest and irrigation sectors. A similar situation exists after the works are completed. In the panchayat sector, the state government has taken away the powers from the assistant engineer to evaluate 10 per cent of the works. As such there is not much technical control over the works completed in the panchayat sector. Similarly in PWD, irrigation and forest sectors, the DRDA basically depends on the unutilisation certificate and the completion certificate

only. In the works conducted by these agencies, the element of supervision was totally missing. This is consequence of two factors: first the responsibilities at the district level under the programme is divided between DRDA and DDO; and secondly, DRDA is looked by executing agencies as a body to approve the annual action plan and resource disbursement. The DDO is concerned primarily with the administrative approval of the works under the programme. As such DRDA does not have any direct control over the blocks and other agencies engaged in the programme. Besides the executing agencies, normally after the release of instalments do not inform the DRDA regarding the number of activities undertaken by them, their exact location, period of commencement, tentative period of completion, etc. As the DRDA does not have any administrative control over the executing agencies, as such it is reluctant to supervise the works. The DDO is reluctant to undertake any systematic supervision due to lack of staff and transport. This division of responsibility coupled with the government's directive with regard to taking away the powers from the assistant engineer to supervise the 10 per cent of the works in the panchayat sector, has resulted in a very weak and ineffective system of supervision. The only functionary who is charged with the responsibility of supervision is Sub-Divisional Officer (SDO). The SDO primarily looks after the supervision of the works under the panchayat sector, that too in a very routine manner. Even this official has no contro to supervise the works undertaken under the PWD, irrigation and social forestry sectors.

The only institutional mechanism available for review at present is District Coordination Committee, which is attended by BDOs and officials of PWD, social forestry, irrigation and soil conservation and presided over by the collector. This institutional mechanism is primarily concerned with the utilisation of grant and as well as resolving the difficulties confronted by these agencies in the implementation of the programme. The analysis made in this report amply shows that the District Coordination Committee meeting looks at the problems in a very cursory manner and emphasis is paid primarily to the utilisation of the grant and

target achievement. The major problems that are confronted in the implementation of the programme are not at all discussed. Similarly, we have seen that dysfunctionalities in the programme occur in its planning, implementation, problem of incomplete works, lack of synchronisation between release of cash and foodgrains component, allotment problem and problem of technical supervision, etc., which are not discussed at length. It is also important to note that the institutional mechanism devised for implementation of the programme at the gram yanchayat level is not adhered to at all.

The basic problem emanates since no single institution is fully charged either with the responsibility of overseeing the implementation of the programme or with a proper review of the programme from time to time for the fulfilment of its objectives. It has resulted in total adhocism as far as important decisions are concerned. Besides, the panchayat bodies are made responsible for the execution of this programme without giving them allotment and supply of foodgrains at the right time, etc. This has resulted in the effectiveness of the programme being eroded.

Impact of the Programme

It has been estimated that more than 70 per cent of the rural population in Durg and Raipur districts are below the poverty line. Due to backwardness of the agriculture and lack of industrial development in the districts, the landless labourers hardly get employment in agricultural work for three months. The wage rate is also very low. Under agricultural operations, labourers are paid in kind equivalent to Rs. four to Rs. six per day. In some of the blocks of the Raipur district, we also found the existence of bonded labour system. Due to non-availability of work, agricultural labourers are willing to work during off-season for very poor wages. There is also a high incidence of indebtedness.

The employment provided under the programme in a year varied between one week to four weeks only. Out of this, up to one week employment was provided to 7.5 per cent, between one week to two weeks to 40 per cent, two to three weeks to 30 per cent and three weeks to four weeks 22.5 per cent. In

the panchayat sector the beneficiaries of the sample, by and large, did not get employment for more than one week at a time. This was due to the allotment problem and as a consequence works were taken in different spells of time resulting in change of composition of the labourers. In the sample, labourers getting employment between two weeks to four weeks were mostly engaged in earth works like road, tank deepening, forest, etc. As such, there was total inadequacy of employment generated under the programme in comparison to the prevailing rate of under-employment and un-employment in both the districts. This is due to high percentage of proverty coupled with the meagre allotment at the block level which varied between Rs. five lakh to Rs. eight lakh in a year and the fact that employment generated at the individual works level was also very low. There is a ceiling of not taking up works of more than Rs. 50,000 under the panchayat sector. By and large in earth works, the workers turn out was high, in the range of 100 to 300 and the works were also completed within a very short period of time. There is no system of registration of workers in Raipur and Durg districts. Due to the labour force characteristics and the prevailing market wage rate, the works under the programme are very attractive. For example, in case of Kodia gram panchayat (Dhamda block), Durg district, the workers forced the Sarpanch not to employ any person from outside the village, while in Sikripalli gram panchayat (Baghbahara block) the labourers of a pocket of the village where a well was being constructed were denied the jobs in that work.

Out of the sample, 72.5 per cent beneficiaries were from STs and 25 per cent from SCs. This was due to high percentage of STs and SCs population in the blocks surveyed. In terms of land holding pattern, 62.5 per cent beneficiaries were landless, 27.5 per cent were having land holding less than five acres and 10 per cent beneficiaries having land holding between five to ten acre. In terms of distribution of labourers by sex, 63.5 per cent beneficiaries were male, 30 per cent female and 4.5 per cent in the category of children. Due to the size of works undertaken, labour force characteristics, backwardness of agriculture, lack of industrial development in the districts, there was no impact

of the programme on the supply and demand of the labour in agricultural operations. For example, out of sample of 200 beneficiaries, not a single beneficiary got employment under the programme since its inception up to 1984-85.

In a sample of 200, the income generated from this programme varied between Rs. 28 to 112 per beneficiary, as none of the beneficiaries got employment in previous years under the programme. As such change in income level of the beneficiaries was not of any substantive order. Regarding the payment of wages to beneficiaries both in cash and kind, out of the sample, 42.5 per cent received only cash, 25 per cent both cash and foodgrains and in case of 32 5 per cent no payments were made for the duration varying between three to four weeks. In 67.5 per cent cases where the payments were made the periodicity of payment varied between one to two weeks. In earth works, payment were made on piece-rate basis. Some of the beneficiaries pointed out that the measurements were not taken correctly and they were paid less.

Most of the works which have been undertaken in both the districts since its inception have been in the category of community based assets like road, tank deepening, community centres, schools, wells, panchayat bhavan, etc. Approximately 50 per cent of the expenditure in both the districts had gone for earth works like kuccha roads and tank deepening. Not much emphasis was given for creating productive assets like irrigation, drainage, land reclamation, etc.

If we go by the nature of the works undertaken, there is no direct benefit to the rural poor in income and employment generation, etc. There were very few cases where productive type of works were undertaken. In Dondi block, we came across through people's participation, a lift irrigation work which resulted in substantive increase in the income of the beneficiaries. No emphasis has been given in understanding the felt needs of the area, resulting in similar type of activities been undertaken year by year. The creation of community based assets like schools, panchayat bhavan, and community hall resulted in providing limited benefit to the rural poor.

MAJOR POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Provision for supplementary rural employment has been a programme of key importance for amelioration of the conditions of the rural poor especially since the Third Five Year Plan. Within this broad approach, a number of permutations and combinations have been tried in terms of target group, choice of works, involvement of panchayats and labour cooperatives, wages and materials component, etc. Though the rural employment programmes have a long history they were taken in a half hearted manner. In the Sixth Plan the NREP was given a conspicuous role in the strategy of poverty alleviation. As a matter of fact, this is the only programme which was implemented for the longest stretch of time (1980 to 1989). However, India's penchant for proliferation of programmes surfaced again with the introduction of RLEGP in 1983. Instead of one programme well conceived and well designed, India had, thus, two programmes from 1983 to March 1989. A definite shift in the policy of rural employment took place in 1989 with the introduction of Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY). The earlier programmes, *i.e.*, NREP and RLEGP, consequently, stand merged with the JRY. During 1989-90, a sum of Rs. 2,625 crore has been allocated for this scheme. In this programme, two important assumptions have been made: (*i*) the new programme will provide fuller employment opportunities to at least one member of each family living below the poverty line who seeks unskilled employment, and (*ii*) the distribution of resources directly to gram panchayat will result in increasing the coverage of the programme to all the rural areas.

If we compare the expenditure incurred on the Centrally sponsored rural employment programmes, *vis-a-vis*, in other developmental spheres so as to provide a perspective; up to the end of Seventh Plan we shall have spent approximately Rs. 27,000 crore on the large irrigation projects, Rs. 2,723 crore on forestry and soil and water conservation programmes up to the end of Sixth Plan. Up to the end of March 1988, we have invested Rs. 71,299 crore in the Central Public Sector. Up till the end of the Seventh Plan (1989-90), we shall

have spent nearly Rs. 11,000 crore[1] on rural employment programmes. The expenditure incurred in these programmes from 1961-62 to 1986-87 was Rs. 5,244.647 crore. Moreover, during the last three years of the Seventh Plan (1987-88 to 1989-90) we shall have spent almost equal amount on these programmes. As a matter of fact, the average annual allocation in these programmes since the beginning of the Seventh Plan is Rs. 1,500 crore. It will not be out of place to mention that nowhere in the developing countries, rural employment programmes differing in objectives and related aspects have been experimented as in India. It is also true that nowhere (except for China) rural employment programmes on such a scale have been undertaken. Yet, the outcome is not significantly different from the previous programmes. The results in terms of employment and income generation and assets creation have been disappointing. The policy so far adopted cared more for achievement of certain targets alone. As a matter of fact in the implementation of these programmes we continued to make all too familiar mistakes, programme after programme. For example, it became evident during the implementation of RWP, CSRE, FFW and NREP that in terms of employment and income generation these programmes touched only the fringe of the problem. Similarly in the creation of physical assets, both regarding the type of schemes and durability of the assets the results are still far from satisfactory. In fact, durability of the assests created up to NREP were of doubtful utility. However, the position slightly improved

[1]The break up is as follows :

	(*Rs. in crore*)
— Expenditure incurred under various rural employment programmes from 1961-62 to 1986-87 (See Table 2.1)	5,244.647
— Expenditure incurred 1987-88 (NREP)	788.31
— Expenditure incurred 1987-88 (RLEGP)	653.53
— Allocation of funds 1988-89 (NREP)	934.13
— Allocation of funds 1988-89 (RLEGP)	730.00
— Allocation of funds 1989-90 (JRY)	2,625.00
TOTAL	10,974.744

both in NREP and RLEGP but the basic problem still remains. Partly it is due to the political interference at the implementation level which does not permit any planning of works based on the felt needs. Besides, this programme did not give a sharp focus either to the target group to be employed or to the type of works which should be undertaken for income generation. The size of allocations at the implementation level was measely, which resulted, in providing meagre supplementary employment opportunities for a very limited number of persons for a short duration. Lack of technical as well as administrative supervision resulted in works of technically inferior quality. This has happened in spite of a number of institutional arrangements having been made for the technical and administrative supervision of the programme. In 1983, RLEGP was introduced to provide employment to a member of landless family for 100 days in a year. Due to faulty planning we have not been able to provide employment to the target group even in this programme. It looks strange that we added another programme but there was not much difference in both these programmes. It was not possible for the various development departments at district level to implement such a complex programme which required a completion of a series of exercises such as identification of landless families, formulation of schemes so as to provide employment to such persons for 100 days, etc. This did not take place and as a consequence we witnessed in RLEGP works which were implemented by the various development departments without assessing the precise requirements both in terms of employment and creating of assets. In the JRY target of reaching each and every panchayat in the country and providing employment of 50 to 100 days in a year at least to one member of the family appears to be unrealistic. The total funds required for a complete coverage would be over Rs. 3,000 crore.[2] The present allocation, therefore, would

[2]R.C. Dutt, "Jawahar Rozgar Yojana; Towards Eradication of Poverty?" *Mainstream*, August 5, 1989, p. 7; and C. Narayanaswamy, "Jawahar Rozgar Yojana—The Myth and the Reality", *Indian Express*, July 20, 1989.

be quite insufficient to meet the objectives. The new criterion for allocation of funds has also come under criticism from the state governments, especially those under opposition parties. It has been pointed out by such states that Centre has adopted discriminatory attitude in allocating the funds for these states.[3] Similarly, the allocation of funds to the panchayats depends on the population. It has been commented that due to this revised criterion the panchayats with high degree population will gain on the panchayats having vast geographical areas and scattered population.[4]

Another interesting development had been the marked initiative taken by the states in regard to rural employment generation. In this connection, mention must particularly be made of the Employment Guarantee Scheme (Maharashtra), Right to Work Scheme (Gujarat), Test Relief Works (West Bengal), Labour-cum-Development Banks (Kerala), etc.[5] However, except for the Maharashtra Employment Guarantee Scheme, most of the other programmes did not last long to make a proper assessment regarding their operational feasibility and impact.

The Maharashtra Employment Guarantee Scheme has been universally acclaimed for providing legal guarantee of the right to work on productive projects.[6] By providing these

[3]K.V. Rao, "Jawahar Rozgar Yojana, Old Wine in New Bottle", *Business Standard*, June 21, 1989 and "A Poll Gimmick and a Rehash, Pre-Election Survey-2, Jawahar Rozgar Yojana", *Times of India*, July 31, 1989.

[4]C. Narayanaswamy, *op. cit*.

[5]Land Army of Karnataka is not included in this list as it is an implementing organization and not a supplementary employment programme.

[6]V.M. Dandekar and N. Rath, *Poverty in India*, Pune Indian School of Political Economy, 1971, pp. 140-44; K. Dandekar, "Tackling of Unemployment Problem through Employment Guarantee" in R.K. Sinha (Edited), *Labour Mobilization and Maximising Employment*, New Delhi, Deep and Deep 1983, p. 189; Amrita Abraham, "Maharashtra's Employment Guarantee Scheme", *Economic and Political Weekly*, August 9, 1980, pp. 1339-40; Raj Krishna, "Ideology and Economic Policy", *Indian Economic Review*, Vol. XXIII, No. 1, January-June, 1988, p. 23. Hannan Ezekiel and Johann, C. Stuyt, "Maharashtra EGS : Problems and

(*Continued on next page*)

opportunities arising out of structural, seasonal and crisis situations,[7] this scheme has been able to significantly help the rural poor from destitution and misery. A by-product of this scheme has been an emergence of unionism even though it is not evenly spread nor of militant variety. It has induced a feeling among the poor to organise themselves to take up works, yet modest in nature on their own volition.[8] The operation of this scheme has also shown that by providing open-ended guarantee of employment, it has prevented the migration of rural poor during drought and natural calamities to the cities. The administrative arrangements made for this scheme combines on the one hand, assigning tasks according to the specific requirements of the area and on the other maintaining technical standards in the works.

All development efforts have proceeded so far in a manner which have not been able to contain the problem of unemployed and underemployed in the rural areas. As a matter of fact, whatever be the declared objectives, the developmental policies in India seem to have cared too little either for employment or distributional objectives. After formulating a number of measures since the Fifth Plan for the people below the poverty line, it is clearly recognised that there is a need for discriminating policy framework in this sector. However, as far as the Centrally sponsored rural employment programmes are concerned, it is now being generally felt that such programme have been found wanting. This is primarily due to the fact that the programme design itself was defective. What is now required is to take up the rural employment programme in a much bolder spirit than hitherto undertaken. As a matter of fact, these programmes

(*Continued from previous page*)

Employment Trends", *Economic Times*, May 31, 1989; "Maharashtra EGS: Seasonal Patterns and Crisis", *Economic Times*, June 1, 1989; "Maharashtra EGS: Suggestions for Improvement", *Economic Times*, June 2, 1989; and Darryl D'Monte, "Jobs in the Villages: Social Organization Crucial", *Times of India*, May 15, 1989.

[7]Hannan Ezekiel and Johann C. Stuyt, "Maharashtra EGS: Seasonal Pattern and Crisis", *op. cit.*

[8]Darryl D'Monte, *op. cit.*

have great potential taking into account the magnitude of the unemployed and underemployed people in rural areas. It is estimated that by 2000 AD India's population would be 950 million and our requirements for foodgrains would be in the neighbourhood of 225 million tons with simultaneous increase in demand for other items of common consumption. At the same time, it has been pointed out that land/man ratio (cultivable land) has declined from 0.48 hectares in 1951 to 0.20 hectares in 1981 and by 2000 AD, it is likely to decline further to 0.15 hectares.[9] It has been estimated that more than 50 per cent of the crop land suffers from various forms of soil degradation.[10] Besides, due to onslaught on our forest resources the ecological system is under severe threat. As a consequence there is no dearth for taking up productive works. There is a need to take up in this programme various schemes relating to land levelling, soil and water conservation, reclamation of saline, alkaline, acidic, and water logged lands, construction of irrigation channels and drains, afforestation, etc. What is required is to have an All India Employment Guarantee Scheme broadly on the lines of the Maharashtra Employment Guarantee Scheme providing right to work on rural public works projects. As a matter of policy, there is a need to make increasing use of labour cooperatives in this scheme. Besides, integrating such projects with the on-going area development schemes is also necessary. There is a great potential, if the selection of the productive projects is not based exclusively on the bureaucracy but also involves the poor in the decision making process in the real sense of the term.[11] It would go a long way for providing a more sustainable basis of develop-

[9]National Land Use and Conservation Board, National Land Use Policy: Outline and Action Points, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture, New Delhi, 1988, pp. 1-2.

[10]B.B. Vohra, *A Policy For Land And Water* (Patel Memorial Lectures 1980), Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi, p. 29; and National Committee on the Development of Backward Areas, *Report on General Issues Relating to Backward Areas Development*, Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, 1981, pp. 38-40.

[11]Darryl D'Monte, *op. cit.*

ment. The selection of works "ought to be structured around the specific needs of the community it is supposed to serve".[12] Another important aspect which should form a part of the operating guidelines of the scheme is the need for "linking asset creation by the poor as asset ownership by institutions organised for the poor".[13] In this manner it is possible to strengthen the income base of the rural poor on a permanent basis. The financial requirement on Employment Guarantee Scheme envisaged on All India basis would be of considerable magnitude. In an investment of such a magnitude, it is necessary for the states also to raise resources to meet part of the outlay. The EGS Maharashtra is paid for largely through taxes levied by the Government of Maharashtra. As it would be difficult for the states alone to raise resources, the Central assistance should be 50 per cent of the outlay in each state on this scheme.

[12]Darryl D'Monte, *op. cit.*

[13]Keith Griffin, "Rural Poverty in Asia : Analysis and Policy Alternatives" in R. Islam (Edited), *Strategies for Alleviating Poverty in Rural Asia.* International Labour Organisation, Asian Employment Programme, Bangkok, 1985, pp. 64-65.

ANNEXURE

	PIREP	*FFW*
soil conserva- n, land recla- otection, anti- easures, pisci- rinking water tion of roads.	Soil conservation, minor irrigation, farm forestry, reclamation and development of land, drainage, embankments, water conservation and ground water recharging, pisci-culture tanks, pasture development, rural godowns, roads, buildings, rural water supply, school buildings, houses for weaker sections.	Works which are productive in nature and create durable community assets which strengthen the rural infrastructure.
ed scheme with -in-aid.	Rs. 46 lakh per block for a period of three years: (first year Rs. 10 lakh, second year Rs. 15.79 lakh and third year Rs. 20.57 lakh.)	During 1977-78 and 1978-79 the allocations of foodgrains were made on the basis of realistic requirements received from the various states. During 1979-80, 50 per cent of the foodrgains were allocated on the basis of rural population in each state and 50 per cent on the basis of their performance in the previous year. The utilisation of foodgrains was directly linked with the augmentation of financial resources by the state governments.

CHART

SIGNIFICANT ASPECTS OF RURAL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMMES

	RWP/RMP	*CSRE*	*PIREP*	*FFW*	*NREP*	*RLEGP*
Objectives	Supplementing the effort under development programme in the plan; to create opportunities for continuing employment to all able bodided and willing persons; to harness the unutilised rural manpower to the fullest extent possible; to create a permanent addition to the productive capacity and to the employment potentional of the area, provision of additional employment opportunity to agriculture workers based on community action to create community assets.	Direct generation of employment in all the districts of the country through the execution of projects which are essentially labour intensive; the production of assets of a durable nature in consonance with local development plans so that alround-development of the district is assisted.	Basically Action-cum-Research project to provide employment to all those offering their services for a wage through execution of work projects; to utilise the funds appropriated for the project for creating durable assets of a continuing nature; to explore the possibility of imparting new skills to some workers and of assisting them in finding continuous employment in the secondary and tertiary sectors in rural or urban areas.	Providing gainful employment opportunities to the poorer sections of the rural community and strengthening the infrastructure leading to better living standards in the rural areas.	Additional gainful employment for the unemployed and under-employed persons, creation of productive community assets for direct and continuing benefits to the poverty groups and for strengthening rural infrastructure; improvement in the overall quality of life in the rural areas.	To provide guarantee of employment to at least one member of every rural landless labour households up to 100 days in a year; to create productive and durable assets for direct and continuing benefits to the poverty groups and for strengthening rural infrastructure.
Target groups	Provide employment for 100 days during the agricultural slack season for about one lakh persons in the first year, about four to five lakh of persons in the second year, about a million in the third year rising to about 2.5 million in the last year of the plan.	Person belonging to families where no adult member was employed; to generate employment to 1,000 persons in a year in every district; on an average 2.5 lakh mandays to be generated in every district.	Provide employment to at least 1,000 persons in a year in every district and employment to one person in a family in which nobody was employed.	Rural poor.	Rural poor.	Rural landless labourers.
Selection of areas	Rural areas where there is heavy pressure of population on land, considerable unemployment and underemployment. At least in one of the blocks in the district selected under the (Intensive Agricultural District Programme) there should be provision for the implementation of rural works programme. The rural works programme should also be taken up in areas selected for the Rural Industries Projects.	All districts with preference to areas where other programmes like SFDA, MFAP, DPAP were not in operation, where the percentage of landless labourers and the incidence of unemployment were high and were relatively less developed.	The blocks selected should cover a variety of agro-climatic conditions prevailing in different parts of the country and should be representative in character. The Government of India selected the districts but the choice of the blocks was left to the discretion of the state government.	In all States/Union Territories.	In all States/Union Territories.	In all States/Union Territories.

CHART

SIGNIFICANT ASPECTS OF RURAL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMMES

	RWP/RMP	*CSRE*	*PIREP*	*FFW*	*NREP*	*RLEGP*
Objectives	Supplementing the effort under development programme in the plan; to create opportunities for continuing employment to all able bodided and willing persons; to harness the unutilised rural manpower to the fullest extent possible; to create a permanent addition to the productive capacity and to the employment potentional of the area, provision of additional employment opportunity to agriculture workers based on community action to create community assets.	Direct generation of employment in all the districts of the country through the execution of projects which are essentially labour intensive; the production of assets of a durable nature in consonance with local development plans so that alround-development of the district is assisted.	Basically Action-cum-Research project to provide employment to all those offering their services for a wage through execution of work projects; to utilise the funds appropriated for the project for creating durable assets of a continuing nature; to explore the possibility of imparting new skills to some workers and of assisting them in finding continuous employment in the secondary and tertiary sectors in rural or urban areas.	Providing gainful employment opportunities to the poorer sections of the rural community and strengthening the infrastructure leading to better living standards in the rural areas.	Additional gainful employment for the unemployed and under-employed persons, creation of productive community assets for direct and continuing benefits to the poverty groups and for strengthening rural infrastructure; improvement in the overall quality of life in the rural areas.	To provide guarantee of employment to at least one member of every rural landless labour households up to 100 days in a year; to create productive and durable assets for direct and continuing benefits to the poverty groups and for strengthening rural infrastructure.
Target groups	Provide employment for 100 days during the agricultural slack season for about one lakh persons in the first year, about four to five lakh of persons in the second year, about a million in the third year rising to about 2.5 million in the last year of the plan.	Person belonging to families where no adult member was employed; to generate employment to 1,000 persons in a year in every district; on an average 2.5 lakh mandays to be generated in every district.	Provide employment to at least 1,000 persons in a year in every district and employment to one person in a family in which nobody was employed.	Rural poor.	Rural poor.	Rural landless labourers.
Selection of areas	Rural areas where there is heavy pressure of population on land, considerable unemployment and underemployment. At least in one of the blocks in the district selected under the (Intensive Agricultural District Programme) there should be provision for the implementation of rural works programme. The rural works programme should also be taken up in areas selected for the Rural Industries Projects.	All districts with preference to areas where other programmes like SFDA, MFAP, DPAP were not in operation, where the percentage of landless labourers and the incidence of unemployment were high and were relatively less developed.	The blocks selected should cover a variety of agro-climatic conditions prevailing in different parts of the country and should be representative in character. The Government of India selected the districts but the choice of the blocks was left to the discretion of the state government.	In all States/Union Territories.	In all States/Union Territories.	In all States/Union Territories.

	RWP/RMP	*CSRE*	*PIREP*	*FFW*	
Works to be taken up	Works which contribute to increased agricultural production; labour intensive; utilise local resources to maximum extent possible; don't involve large expenditure on maehines and materials and capable of being completed within a short period of time. Minor irrigation, soil conservation, land reclamation, drainage and other agricultural production programmes organised on the basis of community effort should be given high priority. Roads connecting number of villages to the market centre should be given priority.	Minor irrigation, soil conservation, afforestation, land reclamation, flood protection, anti-waterlogging measures, pisci-culture tanks, drinking water wells and construction of roads.	Soil conservation, minor irrigation, farm forestry, reclamation and development of land, drainage, embankments, water conservation and ground water recharging, pisci-culture tanks, pasture development, rural godowns, roads, buildings, rural water supply, school buildings, houses for weaker sections.	Works which are productive in nature and create durable community assets which strengthen the rural infrastructure.	Du asse pro hav dire to t gro owr ben ing
Criteria for allocation	Centrally sponsored programme up to 1961-62, expenditure incurred was borne fully by the Central Government. From 1962-63 the expenditure was shared between the Centre and state governments on 50 per cent grant and 50 per cent loan basis.	Centrally sponsored scheme with 100 per cent grant-in-aid.	Rs. 46 lakh per block for a period of three years: (first year Rs. 10 lakh, second year Rs. 15.79 lakh and third year Rs. 20.57 lakh.)	**During 1977-78 and 1978-79 the allocations of foodgrains were made on the basis of realistic requirements received from the various states. During 1979-80, 50 per cent of the foodrgains were allocated on the basis of rural population in each state and 50 per cent on the basis of their performance in the previous year. The utilisation of foodgrains was directly linked with the augmentation of financial resources by the state governments.**	**Cen 50:5(Cen *Cent* 50 pe to nu rers, mers cent incid each *State* 50 p numb marg 50 pe denc distri of inc not a tage of sc duled**

	RWP/RMP	CSRE	PIREP	FFW	
Works to be taken up	Works which contribute to increased agricultural production; labour intensive; utilise local resources to maximum extent possible; don't involve large expenditure on machines and materials and capable of being completed within a short period of time. Minor irrigation, soil conservation, land reclamation, drainage and other agricultural production programmes organised on the basis of community effort should be given high priority. Roads connecting number of villages to the market centre should be given priority.	Minor irrigation, soil conservation, afforestation, land reclamation, flood protection, anti-waterlogging measures, pisci-culture tanks, drinking water wells and construction of roads.	Soil conservation, minor irrigation, farm forestry, reclamation and development of land, drainage, embankments, water conservation and ground water recharging, pisci-culture tanks, pasture development, rural godowns, roads, buildings, rural water supply, school buildings, houses for weaker sections.	Works which are productive in nature and create durable community assets which strengthen the rural infrastructure.	D a p h d t g o b in
Criteria for allocation	Centrally sponsored programme up to 1961-62, expenditure incurred was borne fully by the Central Government. From 1962-63 the expenditure was shared between the Centre and state governments on 50 per cent grant and 50 per cent loan basis.	Centrally sponsored scheme with 100 per cent grant-in-aid.	Rs. 46 lakh per block for a period of three years: (first year Rs. 10 lakh, second year Rs. 15.79 lakh and third year Rs. 20.57 lakh.)	During 1977-78 and 1978-79 the allocations of foodgrains were made on the basis of realistic requirements received from the various states. During 1979-80, 50 per cent of the foodrgains were allocated on the basis of rural population in each state and 50 per cent on the basis of their performance in the previous year. The utilisation of foodgrains was directly linked with the augmentation of financial resources by the state governments.	Ce 50: Ce *Cen* 50 p to r rers mer cent inci each *Stat* 50 p num mar 50 p denc distr of in not a tage of s duled

	RWP/RMP	CSRE	PIREP	FFW	NREP	RLEGP
Earmarking of allocations	Expenditure on roads limited to 50 per cent of the total expenditure in a year. Cost on any work should not exceed Rs. 50,000.	An uniform allocation of Rs. 12.50 lakh per district.	—	During 1977-78 utilisation was restricted to the maintenance of the assets created previously. From 1978-79 utilisation was allowed for on-going plan and non-plan works also.	25 per cent of the annual allocation to the States/UTs will be earmarked for social forestry and 10 per cent will be earmarked for works exclusively benefiting scheduled castes/scheduled tribes.	25 per cent for social forestry projects, 10 per cent of the annual allocation of the States/UTs will be earmarked for projects which exclusively benefit scheduled castes and scheduled tribes; funds will be earmarked each year for construction of micro-habitates and houses for scheduled castes/scheduled tribes and freed bonded labourers under the Indira Awaas Yojana. Rs. six crore would be earmarked each year for the rural sanitation.
Planning of works	The programme should be fully integrated with programmes under the community development and of various development departments which fall within the selected area.	The size of a project ordinarily be such that it would employ a minimum of 50 persons continuously for 15 weeks.	Work projects should form part of the area development plan.	No obligation on the state to prepare shelf of projects, both in works undertaken by panchayats and other technical departments.	A shelf of projects will be prepared for works to be undertaken in the district. The shelf of projects should be based on the felt needs of the people and the village community should be involved in its preparation. It is necessary to establish suitable linkage into other rural development programmes such as Minimum Needs Programme, Desert Development Programme, Drought Prone Area Programme and Integrated Rural Development Programme. On the basis of the shelf of projects an annual action plan for the district may be prepared and approved by the DRDA before the start of the financial year to which the action plan relates.	A shelf of projects will be prepared by state government for works to be undertaken in this programme. Projects should be taken up in areas with high concentration of rural landless population. The projects should be planned in such a way that there is an optimal mix of different sectoral activities leading to maximisation of employment and benefit to the rural community through the creation of productive and durable assets. A project need not be confined to one block or district. The area covered under the project may be determined on the basis of the project requirements and the agency entrusted for implementation. The approach to project formulation should be systematic and based on requisite surveys and master plans for districts, regions or state. A Central Committee has been set up by the Centre for sanctioning specific

	RWP/RMP	CSRE	PIREP	FFW	NREP	RLEGP
Earmarking of allocations	Expenditure on roads limited to 50 per cent of the total expenditure in a year. Cost on any work should not exceed Rs. 50,000.	An uniform allocation of Rs. 12.50 lakh per district.	—	During 1977-78 utilisation was restricted to the maintenance of the assets created previously. From 1978-79 utilisation was allowed for on-going plan and non-plan works also.	25 per cent of the annual allocation to the States/UTs will be earmarked for social forestry and 10 per cent will be earmarked for works exclusively benefiting scheduled castes/scheduled tribes.	25 per cent for social forestry projects, 10 per cent of the annual allocation of the States/UTs will be earmarked for projects which exclusively benefit scheduled castes and scheduled tribes; funds will be earmarked each year for construction of micro-habitates and houses for scheduled castes/scheduled tribes and freed bonded labourers under the Indira Awaas Yojana. Rs. six crore would be earmarked each year for the rural sanitation.
Planning of works	The programme should be fully integrated with programmes under the community development and of various development departments which fall within the selected area.	The size of a project ordinarily be such that it would employ a minimum of 50 persons continuously for 15 weeks.	Work projects should form part of the area development plan.	No obligation on the state to prepare shelf of projects, both in works undertaken by panchayats and other technical departments.	A shelf of projects will be prepared for works to be undertaken in the district. The shelf of projects should be based on the felt needs of the people and the village community should be involved in its preparation. It is necessary to establish suitable linkage into other rural development programmes such as Minimum Needs Programme, Desert Development Programme, Drought Prone Area Programme and Integrated Rural Development Programme. On the basis of the shelf of projects an annual action plan for the district may be prepared and approved by the DRDA before the start of the financial year to which the action plan relates.	A shelf of projects will be prepared by state government for works to be undertaken in this programme. Projects should be taken up in areas with high concentration of rural landless population. The projects should be planned in such a way that there is an optimal mix of different sectoral activities leading to maximisation of employment and benefit to the rural community through the creation of productive and durable assets. A project need not be confined to one block or district. The area covered under the project may be determined on the basis of the project requirements and the agency entrusted for implementation. The approach to project formulation should be systematic and based on requisite surveys and master plans for districts, regions or state. A Central Committee has been set up by the Centre for sanctioning specific

	RWP/RMP	CSRE	PIREP	FFW	NREP	RLEGP
						work projects prepared by the states. An annual action plan will be prepared by the state government on the basis of the shelf of projects and taking into account the size of the allocation and carry over funds.
Wage and Non-wage components	60 : 40	75 : 25	60 : 40	—	50 : 50 (District as a whole)	50 : 50 (Project as a whole)
Wages	Wages should be paid at local slack season rates.	Off season rates and total wages not exceeding Rs. 100 per month.	Off season rates	Minimum wages.	Minimum wages.	Minimum wages.
Mode of payment	Cash.	Cash.	Cash.	Partly or fully in foodgrains.	Partly in foodgrains and partly in cash. One kg. of foodgrains per day may be given as part of the wages and the balance amount may be in cash.	Partly foodgrains partly in cash. (The states which accept the foodgrains as additionality, 50 per cent wages will be paid in foodgrains. In case of other states, one kg. of foodgrains per day as part of wages).
Involvement of panchayat institutions	Association of the panchayats and the local institutions with the execution and the supervision of the scheme	The actual schemes for implementation were chosen at the district level in consultation with Zila Parishad.	—	Panchayati Raj Institutions may also be entrusted with the execution of works.	In the panchayat sector, the Panchayati Raj Institutions are entrusted with the task of execution of works.	The projects can be entrusted to Panchayati Raj Institutions for implementation.
Involvement of labour cooperatives	Labour cooperatives to be drawn fully in the execution of the programme.	—	—	—	—	—
Standards and specifications of works	—	Estimates for execution of all items under the scheme will be the same as are prevalent for similar works in the state. The Department of Rural Development, Government of India, did not prescribe any specifications for the various works to be taken up.	—	—	The state governments should lay down minimum technical standards and specifications for different types of works.	The state governments should lay down minimum technical standards and specifications for different types of works.

	RWP/RMP	CSRE	PIREP	FFW	NREP	RLEGP
						work projects prepared by the states. An annual action plan will be prepared by the state government on the basis of the shelf of projects and taking into account the size of the allocation and carry over funds.
Wage and Non-wage components	60 : 40	75 : 25	60 : 40	—	50 : 50 (District as a whole)	50 : 50 (Project as a whole)
Wages	Wages should be paid at local slack season rates.	Off season rates and total wages not exceeding Rs. 100 per month.	Off season rates	Minimum wages.	Minimum wages.	Minimum wages.
Mode of payment	Cash.	Cash.	Cash.	Partly or fully in foodgrains.	Partly in foodgrains and partly in cash. One kg. of foodgrains per day may be given as part of the wages and the balance amount may be in cash.	Partly foodgrains partly in cash. (The states which accept the foodgrains as additionality, 50 per cent wages will be paid in foodgrains. In case of other states, one kg. of foodgrains per day as part of wages).
Involvement of panchayat institutions	Association of the panchayats and the local institutions with the execution and the supervision of the scheme	The actual schemes for implementation were chosen at the district level in consultation with Zila Parishad.	—	Panchayati Raj Institutions may also be entrusted with the execution of works.	In the panchayat sector, the Panchayati Raj Institutions are entrusted with the task of execution of works.	The projects can be entrusted to Panchayati Raj Institutions for implementation.
Involvement of labour cooperatives	Labour cooperatives to be drawn fully in the execution of the programme.	—	—	—	—	—
Standards and specifications of works	—	Estimates for execution of all items under the scheme will be the same as are prevalent for similar works in the state. The Department of Rural Development, Government of India, did not prescribe any specifications for the various works to be taken up.	—	—	The state governments should lay down minimum technical standards and specifications for different types of works.	The state governments should lay down minimum technical standards and specifications for different types of works.

	RWP/RMP	CSRE	PIREP	FFW	NREP	RLEGP
Maintenance of works	There should be a definite assurance that the assets created would be maintained by a responsible body or institution. The assurance might be from the panchayat or the department concerned.	Annual maintenance items will not be taken up under this scheme, responsibilities for the maintenance of the projects shall be of the state governments.	—	—	State governments should make adequate arrangements for maintenance of assets created under the programme.	State governments.
Community contribution	Schemes included in the programme should carry same rate of contribution as the schemes belonging to the same category taken up in the area as part of the regular state plan, same pattern as far similar works under community development or local development programme.	—	—	—	—	—

	RWP/RMP	CSRE	PIREP	FFW	NREP	RLEGP
Maintenance of works	There should be a definite assurance that the assets created would be maintained by a responsible body or institution. The assurance might be from the panchayat or the department concerned.	Annual maintenance items will not be taken up under this scheme, responsibilities for the maintenance of the projects shall be of the state governments.	—	—	State governments should make adequate arrangements for maintenance of assets created under the programme.	State governments.
Community contribution	Schemes included in the programme should carry same rate of contribution as the schemes belonging to the same category taken up in the area as part of the regular state plan, same pat tern as far similar works under community development or local development programme.	—	—	—	—	—

TABLES

TABLE 2.1 RURAL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMMES (1961-62—1986-87)

Expenditure/Employment Generated/Physical Assets	*RWP (1961-66)*	*RMP (1966-69)*	*CSRE (1971-74)*	*PIREP (1972-76)*	*FFW (1977-80)*	*NREP (1980-85)*	*NREP (1985-86)*	*NREP (1986-87)*	*RLEGP (1983-85)*	*RLEGP (1985-86)*	*RLEGP (1986-87)*	*Total*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
A. Expenditure (Rs. in crore)	19.33	20.28	127.17	9.11	511.91	1,834.25	531.00	717.77	384.74	453.177	635.91	5,244.647
B. Employment Generated (Lakh mandays)	824.33	609.19	3,157.00	177.88	8,981.39	17,751.80	3,160.00	3,953.90	2,628.10	2,475.80	3,061.40	46,780.79
C. Physical Assets												
MI (hec.)	69,413.76	1,25,753.00	1,37,894.00	15,901.00	8,90,996.00	9,32,000.00	—	—	17,469.00	18,624.21	87,136.21	22,95,187.18
MI/FP (hec.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	48,000.00	55,000.00	—	—	—	1,03,000.00
FP (hec.)	—	—	1,79,255.00	92.00	3,64,093.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	5,43,440.00
WC (hec.)	—	—	1,922.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,922.00
RI (km.)	—	—	—	—	2,81,361.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,81,361.00
RC (km.)	—	—	—	1,855.00	2,03,084.00	—	63,000.00	39,000.00	4,893.64	12,048.83	15,280.50	3,39,161.97
RC/I (km.)	9,972.80	16,495.00	68,676.00	—	—	4,45,000.00	—	—	—	—	—	5,40,143.80
SC (hec.)	—	—	25,207.00	11,058.00	8,61,393.00	5,14,000.00	16,000.00	4,000.00	6,857.00	75,316.03	85,026.50	15,98,857.53
SC/A (hec.)	1,56,658.29	51,100.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,07,758.29
A (hec.)	—	—	29,245.00	5,087.00	2,61,246.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,95,578.00
SF (hec.)	—	—	—	—	—	4,69,000.00	1,16,000.00	2,18,000.00	17,566.66	53,300.51	2,40,389.25	11,14,256.42
TP (no.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	42,46,00,000.00	70,10,00,000.00	1,23,70,000.00	2,76,13,000.00	37,62,77,000.00	1,54,18,60,000.00
SB (no.)	—	—	—	—	66,753.00	1,11,130.00	—	—	3,447.00	8,408.00	9,080.00	1,98,818.00
SB/PG (no.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	51,000.00	28,000.00	—	—	—	79,000.00
PG/CH (no.)	—	—	—	7.00	2,462.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,469.00
D (hec.)	—	—	1,07,777.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,07,777.00
DWW (no.)	—	—	—	104.00	—	61,000.00	21,000.00	16,000.00	—	—	—	98,104.00
PT (hec.)	—	—	2,439.00	30.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,469.00
VT (no.)	—	—	—	—	—	54,000.00	5,000.00	6,000.00	—	—	—	65,000.00
AS (hec.)	—	19,789.00	442.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20,231.00
LR (hec.)	—	—	15,927.00	148.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	16,075.00
L/FP (hec.)	57,888.66	28,040.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	85,928.66
LL/FC (hec.)	—	—	—	—	1,53,413.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,53,413.00
PLD (hec.)	—	—	626.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	626.00
H.SC/ST (no.)	—	—	—	253.00	—	—	—	—	20,815.00	52,320.00	1,51,813.00	2,25,201.00

Contd.

Table 2.1 RURAL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMMES (1961-62—1986-87)

Expenditure/Employment Generated/Physical Assets	*RWP (1961-66)*	*RMP (1966-69)*	*CSRE (1971-74)*	*PIREP (1972-76)*	*FFW (1977-80)*	*NREP (1980-85)*	*NREP (1985-86)*	*NREP (1986-87)*	*RLEGP (1983-85)*	*RLEGP (1985-86)*	*RLEGP (1986-87)*	*Total*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
A. Expenditure (Rs. in crore)	19.33	20.28	127.17	9.11	511.91	1,834.25	531.00	717.77	384.74	453.177	635.91	5,244.647
B. Employment Generated (Lakh mandays)	824.33	609.19	3,157.00	177.88	8,981.39	17,751.80	3,160.00	3,953.90	2,628.10	2,475.80	3,061.40	46,780.79
C. Physical Assets												
MI (hec.)	69,413.76	1,25,753.00	1,37,894.00	15,901.00	8,90,996.00	9,32,000.00	—	—	17,469.00	18,624.21	87,136.21	22,95,187.18
MI/FP (hec.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	48,000.00	55,000.00	—	—	—	1,03,000.00
FP (hec.)	—	—	1,79,255.00	92.00	3,64,093.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	5,43,440.00
WC (hec.)	—	—	1,922.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,922.00
RI (km.)	—	—	—	—	2,81,361.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,81,361.00
RC (km.)	—	—	—	1,855.00	2,03,084.00	—	63,000.00	39,000.00	4,893.64	12,048.83	15,280.50	3,39,161.97
RC/I (km.)	9,972.80	16,495.00	68,676.00	—	—	4,45,000.00	—	—	—	—	—	5,40,143.80
SC (hec.)	—	—	25,207.00	11,058.00	8,61,393.00	5,14,000.00	16,000.00	4,000.00	6,857.00	75,316.03	85,026.50	15,98,857.53
SC/A (hec.)	1,56,658.29	51,100.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,07,758.29
A (hec.)	—	—	29,245.00	5,087.00	2,61,246.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,95,578.00
SF (hec.)	—	—	—	—	—	4,69,000.00	1,16,000.00	2,18,000.00	17,566.66	53,300.51	2,40,389.25	11,14,256.42
TP (no.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	42,46,00,000.00	70,10,00,000.00	1,23,70,000.00	2,76,13,000.00	37,62,77,000.00	1,54,18,60,000.00
SB (no.)	—	—	—	—	66,753.00	1,11,130.00	—	—	3,447.00	8,408.00	9,080.00	1,98,818.00
SB/PG (no.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	51,000.00	28,000.00	—	--	—	79,000.00
PG/CH (no.)	—	—	—	7.00	2,462.00	—	—	—	—	—	--	2,469.00
D (hec.)	—	—	1,07,777.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,07,777.00
DWW (no.)	—	—	—	104.00	—	61,000.00	21,000.00	16,000.00	—	—	—	98,104.00
PT (hec.)	—	—	2,439.00	30.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,469.00
VT (no.)	—	—	—	—	—	54,000.00	5,000.00	6,000.00	—	—	—	65,000.00
AS (hec.)	—	19,789.00	442.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20 231.00
LR (hec.)	—	—	15,927.00	148.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	16,075.00
L/FP (hec.)	57,888.66	28,040.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	85,928.66
LL/FC (hec.)	—	—	—	—	1,53,413.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,53,413.00
PLD (hec.)	—	—	626.00	--	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	626.00
H.SC/ST (no.)	—	—	—	253.00	—	—	—	—	20,815.00	52,320.00	1,51,813.00	2,25,201.00

Contd.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(01)	(11)	(12)	(13)
WB.SC/ST (no.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	90,000.00	1,24,000.00	—	—	—	2,14,000.00
IW/H (no.)	—	—	—	—	--	4,80,000.00	—	—	—	—	—	4,80,000.00
RS (no.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	60,893.00	60,893.00
C (no.)	—	—	8,178.00	332.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8,510.00
B (no.)	—	—	—	—	—	1,11,870.00	—	—	—	—	—	1,11,870.00
OW (no.)	—	—	—	114	1,50,272.00	2,07,000.00	1,10,000.00	1,36,000.00	—	1,031.00	1,526.00	5,95,943.00

NOTES :

Physical assets as given in the Table 2.1 follow the classification provided in the *Annual Reports of the Department of Rural Development*. The category of Other Works (OW) include : Pilot Intensive Rural employment Project (class rooms) *Food For Work* (levelling of house sites, construction of huts for the weaker sections, repairs and construction of houses damaged due to flood, and house building grants given to the families affected by the natural calamities); *National Rural Employment Programme* (pavement of village streets, village sanitation works including construction of drains, levelling of fields, etc) ; *Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme* (class rooms). Different sources had given expenditure, employment generated and physical assets in different units, to bring uniformity, units had been changed from acre to hectare mile to kilometre and million to lakh and crore.

SOURCES :

Col. 2 Rural Works Programme (1960-61 to 1965-66)

In case of Rural Works Programme, data relating to expenditure and employment generated are complete. The total expenditure incurred was Rs. 19.33 crore, however, the physical assets relate to expenditure of Rs. 9.48 crore only for which the information is available. *Report* 1966-67, Government of India, Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Community Development), New Delhi, pp. 41-43.

Col. 3 Rural Manpower Programme (1966-67 to 1968-69)

Data relating to expenditure incurred and employment generated in Rural Manpower Programme were taken from *Reports* 1967-68, 1968-69, 1969-70 and 1970-71, Government of India, Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Community Development, New Delhi, pp. 40-41 ; 44, 40, 41 respectively. Data relating to physical assets are incomplete as no information is available regarding physical assets created during 1968-69. *Reports* 1967-68, 1968-69, Government of India, Ministry of Food, Agriculture. Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Community Development), New Delhi, pp. 42-43 and 45 respectively, and *Reports* 1970-71 and 1971-72, Government of Indla, Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Community Development), New Delhi, p. 41 and p. 58 respectively. Rural Manpower Programme continued up to March 1969, however the States which were unable to utilise the grant up to March 1969 were asked to spend it in the subsequent years. As such, the programme for such States continued up to 1970-71.

Col. 4 Crash Scheme for Rural Employment (1971-72 to 1973-74)

Data relating to expenditure, employment generated and physical assets created are complete and were taken from *Report* 1974-75, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation Department of Rural Development, New Delhi, pp. 50-52.

Col. 5 Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Project (1972-73 to 1975-76)

Data relating to expenditure and employment generated are complete. However, data regarding physical assets created under the programme are incomplete as data wore available in respeet of Kerala, Orissa and West Bengal upto the period ending April 1975 and for Jammu & Kashmir upto Oct. 1973 only. *Report of the Review Committee on Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Project* (*PIREP*), Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation Department of Rural Development, Government of India, New Delhi. August 1977, p. 75 and p. 78.

Col. 6 Food for Work (1977-78 to 1979-80)

Data relating to expenditure and employment generated were taken from *Ninetieth Report*, *Public Accounts Committee* (1981-82), (Sixth Lok Sabha), Food For Work Programme, Ministry of Rural Development, Lok Sabha *Secratariat*, New Delhi, March 1982 p. 42 and p. 45. Data relating to Physical assets from the *Report* 1980-81, Government of Indla, Ministry of Rural Reconstruction, New Delhi, pp. 78-79.

Col. 7 National Rural Employment Programme (1980-81 to 1984-85)

Annual Report, 1986-87, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, New Delhi, pp. 20-22.

Col. 8 National Rural Employment Programme (1985-86)

Data relating to expenditure incurred and employment generated were taken from the *Annual Report* 1986-87, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, p. 22. Data relating to physical assets were taken from the *Annual Report* 1988-89, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, p. 39.

Col. 9 National Rural Employment Programme (1986-87)

Data relating to expenditure incurred and employment generated were taken from the *Annual Report* 1987-88, Government of India, Department of Rural Development, Ministry of Agriculture, p. 19. Data relating to physical assets were taken from the *Annual Report* 1988-89, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, p. 39.

Cols. 10, 11 & 12 Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (1983-85, 1985-86 and 1986-87)

Data relating to expenditure incurred, employment generated and Physical assets were taken from the *Annual Report*, 1988-89, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, Annexure XXIX.

Abbreviations: MI—Minor irrigation, MI/FP—Minor irrigation/Flood protection, FP—Flood protection, WC—Water conservation, RI—Road improved, RC—Road constructed, RC/I—Road constructed/Improved, SC—Soil conservation, SC/A—Soil conservation/Afforestation, A—Afforestation. SF—Social forestry, TP—Tree planted, SB—School building, SB/PG—School building/Panchayat ghar, PG/CH—Panchayat ghar/Community hall, D—Drainage, DWW—Drinking water wells, PT—Pisiculture tanks, VT—Village tanks, AS—Agriculture scheme, LR—Land reclamation, LR/FP—Land reclamation/Flood protection, LL/FC—Land levelling/Field channeling, PLD—Panchayat land development, H.SC/ST—Houses for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, WB.SC/ST—Works benefiting Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, IW/H—Irrigation wells/Houses, RS—Rural sanitation, C—Culverts, B—Balwadi, OW—Other works, hec.—hectare, km.—kilometer, no —number.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(01)	(11)	(12)	(13)
WB.SC/ST (no.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	90,000.00	1,24,000.00	—	—	—	2,14,000.00
IW/H (no.)	—	—	—	—	—	4,80,000.00	—	—	—	—	—	4,80,000.00
RS (no.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	60,893.00	60,893.00
C (no.)	—	—	8,178.00	332.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8,510.00
B (no.)	—	—	—	—	—	1,11,870.00	—	—	—	—	—	1,11,870.00
OW (no.)	—	—	—	114	1,50,272.00	2,07,000.00	1,10,000.00	1,36,000.00	—	1,031.00	1,526.00	5,95,943.00

NOTES :

Physical assets as given in the Table 2.1 follow the classification provided in the *Annual Reports of the Department of Rural Development*. The category of Other Works (OW) include : Pilot Intensive Rural employment Project (class rooms) *Food For Work* (levelling of house sites, construction of huts for the weaker sections, repairs and construction of houses damaged due to flood, and house building grants given to the families affected by the natural calamities); *National Rural Employment Programme* (pavement of village streets, village sanitation works including construction of drains, levelling of fields, etc) ; *Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme* (class rooms). Different sources had given expenditure, employment generated and physical assets in different units, to bring uniformity, units had been changed from acre to hectare mile to kilometre and million to lakh and crore.

SOURCES :

Col. 2 Rural Works Programme (1960-61 to 1965-66)
In case of Rural Works Programme, data relating to expenditure and employment generated are complete. The total expenditure incurred was Rs. 19.33 crore, however, the physical assets relate to expenditure of Rs. 9.48 crore only for which the information is available. *Report* 1966-67, Government of India, Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Community Development), New Delhi, pp. 41-43.

Col. 3 Rural Manpower Programme (1966-67 to 1968-69)
Data relating to expenditure incurred and employment generated in Rural Manpower Programme were taken from *Reports* 1967-68, 1968-69, 1969-70 and 1970-71, Government of India, Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Community Development, New Delhi, pp. 40-41; 44, 40, 41 respectively. Data relating to physical assets are incomplete as no information is available regarding physical assets created during 1968-69. *Reports* 1967-68, 1968-69, Government of India, Ministry of Food, Agriculture. Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Community Development), New Delhi, pp. 42-43 and 45 respectively, and *Reports* 1970-71 and 1971-72, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Community Development), New Delhi, p. 41 and p. 58 respectively. Rural Manpower Programme continued up to March 1969, however the States which were unable to utilise the grant up to March 1969 were asked to spend it in the subsequent years. As such, the programme for such States continued up to 1970-71.

Col. 4 Crash Scheme for Rural Employment (1971-72 to 1973-74)
Data relating to expenditure, employment generated and physical assets created are complete and were taken from *Report* 1974-75, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation Department of Rural Development, New Delhi, pp. 50-52.

Col. 5 Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Project (1972-73 to 1975-76)
Data relating to expenditure and employment generated are complete. However, data regarding physical assets created under the programme are incomplete as data wore available in respeet of Kerala, Orissa and West Bengal upto the period ending April 1975 and for Jammu & Kashmir upto Oct. 1973 only. *Report of the Review Committee on Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Project (PIREP)*, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation Department of Rural Development, Government of India, New Delhi. August 1977, p. 75 and p. 78.

Col. 6 Food for Work (1977-78 to 1979-80)
Data relating to expenditure and employment generated were taken from *Ninetieth Report, Public Accounts Committee* (1981-82), (Sixth Lok Sabha), Food For Work Programme, Ministry of Rural Development, Lok Sabha *Secratariat*, New Delhi, March 1982 p. 42 and p. 45. Data relating to Physical assets from the *Report* 1980-81, Government of India, Ministry of Rural Reconstruction, New Delhi, pp. 78-79.

Col. 7 National Rural Employment Programme (1980-81 to 1984-85)
Annual Report, 1986-87, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, New Delhi, pp. 20-22.

Col. 8 National Rural Employment Programme (1985-86)
Data relating to expenditure incurred and employment generated were taken from the *Annual Report* 1986-87, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, p. 22. Data relating to physical assets were taken from the *Annual Report* 1988-89, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, p. 39.

Col. 9 National Rural Employment Programme (1986-87)
Data relating to expenditure incurred and employment generated were taken from the *Annual Report* 1987-88, Government of India, Department of Rural Development, Ministry of Agriculture, p. 19. Data relating to physical assets were taken from the *Annual Report* 1988-89, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, p. 39.

Cols. 10, 11 & 12 Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (1983-85, 1985-86 and 1986-87)
Data relating to expenditure incurred, employment generated and Physical assets were taken from the *Annual Report*, 1988-89, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, Annexure XXIX.

Abbreviations: MI—Minor irrigation, MI/FP—Minor irrigation/Flood protection, FP—Flood protection, WC—Water conservation, RI—Road improved, RC—Road constructed, RC/I—Road constructed/Improved, SC—Soil conservation, SC/A—Soil conservation/Afforestation, A—Afforestation. SF—Social forestry, TP—Tree planted, SB—School building, SB/PG—School building/Panchayat ghar, PG/CH—Panchayat ghar/Community hall, D—Drainage, DWW—Drinking water wells, PT—Pisiculture tanks, VT—Village tanks, AS—Agriculture scheme, LR—Land reclamation, LR/FP—Land reclamation/Flood protection, LL/FC—Land levelling/Field channeling, PLD—Panchayat land development, H.SC/ST—Houses for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, WB.SC/ST—Works benefiting Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, IW/H—Irrigation wells/Houses, RS—Rural sanitation, C—Culverts, B—Balwadi, OW—Other works, hec.—hectare, km.—kilometer, no —number.

TABLE 2.2 FINANCIAL PROVISION AND EXPENDITURE INCURRED

(*Rs. in crore*)

Programme	*Financial provision*	*Expenditure incurred*	*Percentage of expenditure incurred*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
RWP (1961-62 to 1965-66)	150.00	19.33	13
RMP (1966-67 to 1968-69)	—	20.28	—
CSRE (1971-72 to 1973-74)	142.74	127.17	89
PIREP (1972-73 to 1975-76)	25.57	9.11	36
FFW (1977-78 to 1979-80)	479.00	511.91	107
NREP (1980-81 to 1984-85)	1,620.00	1,834.25	113
RLEGP (1983-84 to 1984-85)	600.00	384.74	64

SOURCES :

RWP — "Crash Scheme for Rural Employment : A Review", *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*, April 1976, p. 259.

CSRE — "Crash Scheme for Rural Employment : A Review", *Ibid.*, p. 260; and *Report 1974-75*, Government of India, New Delhi, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, Department of Rural Development, p. 50.

PIREP — Report of the Review Committee on *Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Project* (PIREP), Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, New Delhi, Department of Rural Development, Government of India, August 1977, p. 27 and p. 75.

FFW — Public Accounts Committee 1981-82, (Seventh Lok Sabha), *Food for Work Programme*, Ninetieth Report, Ministry of Rural Development, New Delhi, Lok Sabha Secretariat, March 1982, p. 42.

NREP — *Annual Report 1985-86*, Government of India, New Delhi, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, 1986, pp. 21-22.

RLEGP —*Annual Report 1986-87*, Government of India, New Delhi, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, 1987, p. 28.

TABLE 2.2 FINANCIAL PROVISION AND EXPENDITURE INCURRED

(*Rs. in crore*)

Programme	*Financial provision*	*Expenditure incurred*	*Percentage of expenditure incurred*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
RWP (1961-62 to 1965-66)	150.00	19.33	13
RMP (1966-67 to 1968-69)	—	20.28	—
CSRE (1971-72 to 1973-74)	142.74	127.17	89
PIREP (1972-73 to 1975-76)	25.57	9.11	36
FFW (1977-78 to 1979-80)	479.00	511.91	107
NREP (1980-81 to 1984-85)	1,620.00	1,834.25	113
RLEGP (1983-84 to 1984-85)	600.00	384.74	64

SOURCES :

RWP — "Crash Scheme for Rural Employment: A Review", *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*, April 1976, p. 259.

CSRE — "Crash Scheme for Rural Employment : A Review", *Ibid.*, p. 260; and *Report 1974-75*, Government of India, New Delhi, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, Department of Rural Development, p. 50.

PIREP — Report of the Review Committee on *Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Project* (PIREP), Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, New Delhi, Department of Rural Development, Government of India, August 1977, p. 27 and p. 75.

FFW — Public Accounts Committee 1981-82, (Seventh Lok Sabha), *Food for Work Programme*, Ninetieth Report, Ministry of Rural Development, New Delhi, Lok Sabha Secretariat, March 1982, p. 42.

NREP — *Annual Report 1985-86*, Government of India, New Delhi, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, 1986, pp. 21-22.

RLEGP — *Annual Report 1986-87*, Government of India, New Delhi, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, 1987, p. 28.

TABLE 2.3 PATTERN OF SECTORAL EXPENDITURE

(*In per cent*)

Physical assets	*RWP* (1962-63)	*CSRE* (1971-74)	*PIREP* (1972-76)	*NREP* (1985-86)	*RLEGP* (1985-86)	*RLEGP* (1986-87)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Rural Roads	30.00	71.30	52.69	31.36	34.30	26.49
Minor Irrigation	—	12.80	17.91	5.05	12.34	5.62
Soil Conservation	—	—	5.79	1.88	6.87	3.97
Land Development	—	15.90	1.12	—	—	—
Soil Conservation/ Minor Irrigation	68.00	—	—	—	—	—
Afforestation	—	—	3.35	—	—	—
Social Forestry	—	—	—	17.09	15.35	23.38
Construction (buildings)	—	—	—	11.66	—	—
School (buildings)	—	—	1.45	11.22	13.00	4.37
Houses for Weaker Sections	—	—	3.31	7.65	17.46	34.41
Drinking Water Wells	—	—	1.56	3.71	—	—
Rural Godowns	—	—	5.60	—	—	—
Village Tanks	—	—	—	1.56	—	—

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Rural Sanitation	—	—	—	—	—	1.57
Other works	02.00	—	7.22	8.82	0.68	0.19
TOTAL	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

NOTES AND SOURCES :

1. Data in columns 2,3,4,5,6 and 7 gives percentage of sectoral expenditure under different programmes. The percentage of expediture refers to the period mentioned in brackets of each programme only.
2. *Rural Works Programme*, Planning Commission, New Delhi, Government of India, February 1964, p. 11.
3. Under Crash Scheme for Rural Employment the total expenditure was Rs. 127.17 crore. However, the percentage given in Col. 3 shows percentage for Rs. 104.72 crore only for which the data is available. Study of Crash Scheme for Rural Employment, 1971-74; Programme Evaluation Organisation, Planning Commission, New Delhi, Government of India, 1979, p. 8.
4. Out of the total expenditure of Rs. 9.11 crore in Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Project, the data referred in Col. 4 relate to an expenditure of Rs. 6.06 crore only. This data is computed from the tables provided in the Report of the Review Committee on *Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Project* (PIREP), Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, Department of Rural Development, New Delhi, Government of India, August 1977, pp. 82-96.
5. Data regarding the percentage of sectoral expenditure under NREP have been collected from the Department of Rural Development, New Delhi, Government of India, August 1987.
6. Out of the total expenditure of Rs. 435.06 crore under Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (1985-86) data regarding the percentage of expenditure incurred in physical assets relates to an expenditure of Rs. 312.53 crore only for which data are available. Data collected from the Department of Rural Development, New Delhi, Government of India, December, 1987.
7. Out of the total expediture of Rs. 627.73 crore under Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme 1986-87 data regarding the percentage of expenditure incurred in physical assets relate to an expenditure of Rs. 411.58 crore only for which data are available. Data collected from the Department of Rural Development, New Delhi, Government of India, December 1987.

TABLE 2.4 PATTERN OF EXPENDITURE—CATEGORYWISE

Programme	*Directly productive (% of actual expenditure)*	*Economic infra-structure (% of actual expenditure)*	*Social infra-structure (% of actual expenditure)*	*Misc. (% of actual expenditure)*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
RWP (1962-63)	68.00	30.00	—	2.00
CSRE (1971-74)	28.70	71.30	—	—
PIREP (1972-76)	24.82	61.64	6.32	7.22
NREP (1985-86)	6.93	50.01	34.24	8.82
RLEGP (1985-86)	19.21	49.65	30.46	0.68
RLEGP (1986-87)	9.59	49.87	40.35	0.19

NOTES: The data given in the Table is computed from Table 2.1.

Directly Productive : Minor irrigation, land development, soil conservation.

Economic Infrastructure : construction of roads, afforestation, social forestry, village tanks, rural godowns.

Social Infrastructure : construction of schools, drinking water wells, community building houses for weaker section.

Miscellaneous : in the case of *RWP* flood protection, drinking water wells, in *PIREP mahila mandals*, health centre, library, gobar gas, panchayat ghars, play grounds, in case of *NREP* pavement of streets, village sanitation works including construction of drains, levelling of fields, etc., and in the case of *RLEGP mahila mandals*.

TABLE 2.5 EMPLOYMENT GENERATION

Programme	*Employment targets (lakh mandays)*	*Employment generated (lakh mandays)*	*Achievement of employment generated (percentage)*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
RWP (1961-62 to 1965-66)	3,600.00	824.33	23
CSRE (1971-72 to 1973-74)	2,662.50	3,157.00	119
FFW (1977-78 to 1979-80)	14,930.28	8,981.39	61
NREP (1980-81 to 1984-85)	15,000.00 20,000.00	17,751.80	100
RLEGP (1983-84 to 1984-85)	3,600.00	2,627.46	73

SOURCES :

RWP — *Rural Works Programme*, New Delhi, Planning Commission, Government of India, February 1964, p. 3;, and *Report 1966-67*, Government of India, Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation, New Delhi, Department of Community Development, pp. 31-43.

CSRE — *Study of Crash Scheme for Rural Employment, 1971-74*, Programme Evaluation Organisation, New Delhi, Planning Commission, Government of India, 1979, p. 1; and *Report 1974-75*, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, New Delhi, Department of Rural Development, p. 50.

FFW — Public Accounts Committee, 1981-82, (Seventh Lok Sabha) *Food for Work Programme*, Nineteenth Report, Ministry of Rural Development, New Delhi, Lok Sabha Secretariat, March 1982, p. 45.

NREP — *Annual Report, 1986-87*, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, New Delhi, Department of Rural Development, 1987, p. 21.

RLEGP— Data collected from the Department of Rural Development, New Delhi, Government of India, December, 1987.

TABLE 2.6 UNIT COST OF EMPLOYMENT

Programme	*Expenditure incurred (Rs. crore)*	*Employment generated (lakh mandays)*	*Unit cost of employment (Rs.)*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
RWP (1961-62 to 1965-66)	19.33	824.33	2.34
RMP (1966-67 to 1968-69)	20.28	609.19	3.33
CSRE (1971-72 to 1973-74)	127.17	3,157.00	4.02
PIREP (1972-73 to 1975-76)	9.11	177.88	5.11
FFW (1977-78 to 1979-80)	511.91	8,981.39	5.69
NREP (1980-81 to 1984-85)	1,834.25	17,751.80	10.33
NREP (1985-86)	531.00	3,160.00	16.80
NREP (1986-87)	683.94	3,929.50	17.40
RLEGP (1983-84 to 1984-85)	384.74	2,627.46	14.64
RLEGP (1985-86)	453.177	2,475.80	18.28
RLEGP (1986-87)	635.91	3,061.40	20.71

NOTE : The figures of expenditure incurred and mandays generated have been taken from Table 2.1.

TABLE 3.1 POPULATION PROFILE OF DURG AND RAIPUR DISTRICTS—1985

				Rural Population			
District	*Number of blocks*	*Number of villages*	*Total population (per cent)*	*Scheduled castes (per cent)*	*Scheduled tribes (per cent)*	*Others (per cent)*	*Urban population (per cent)*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Durg	12	1,869	18,90,467 (100)	2,23,870 (12.04)	2,38,923 (12.8)	8.26,570 (58.16)	6,01,104 (17.00)
Raipur	24	4,038	30,79,476 (100)	4,24,145 (13.00)	5,71,484 (17.00)	15,24,622 (56.00)	5,29,225 (14.00)

SOURCE: Office of the District Statistical Officer, Durg and Raipur Districts, 1985.

TABLE 3.2 PROFILE OF THE BLOCKS SURVEYED

Districts	*Block*	*Area (in hects.)*	*Number of villages*	*Number of gram panchayats*	*Scheduled castes*	*Scheduled tribes*	*Total population*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Durg	Dondi	NA	118	43	5,082	46.644	72,967
	Balod	NA	89	43	4,135	17,432	62,761
	Dhamda	89,747	181	72	32,097	8,080	1,55,623
Raipur	Baghbahara	1,27,727	243	62	14,151	32,552	1,08,148
	Saraipalli	72,457	241	50	15,838	30,052	1,16,477
	Nagri	61,472	242	51	5,132	73,521	1,19,783
	Mainpur	61,791	100	35	5,358	30,161	55,271

SOURCE: Office of the Block Development Officer, Durg and Raipur Districts, 1985.

TABLE 5.1 SHELF OF PROJECTS, RAIPUR DISTRICT, 1985-86—1989-90

Block	*Number of works*	*Amount (Rs.)*
(1)	(2)	(3)
Aarang	196	88,46,000
Dharsiva	113	47,13,000
Abhanpur	118	53,43,000
Tilda	222	79,73,000
Dhamtari	146	29,60,000
Kurud	119	46,75,000
Nagri	122	76,50,000
Magarload	104	88,77,359
Mahasamund	820	77,45,500
Baghbahara	364	88,96,932
Pithora	150	45,35,000
Basana	192	53,32,256
Saraipalli	83	34,74,000
Chura	216	74,15,000
Gariyaband	171	35,60,000
Mainpur	232	66,25,000
Fingeshwar	75	23,75,000
Devbhog	145	39,35,000
Simga	203	62,80,000
Bhatapara	146	59,62,000
Baloda Bazar	—	—
Kasdol	191	56,16,000
Bilaigarh	—	—
Palari	212	64,28,255

SOURCE: Office of the District Rural Development Agency, Raipur District, May 1985.

TABLE 5.2 NUMBER OF WORKS, EXPENDITURE AND GRANT RECEIVED IN THE BLOCKS SURVEYED DURING 1984-85 AND UP TO JUNE, 1985

District/Block	*Works proposed in annual action plan for the year 1984-85*			*Expenditure proposed (Rs. lakh)*			*Total grant received during 1984-85 (Rs. lakh)*	*Works proposed in annual action plan for the year 1985-86*			*Expenditure proposed (Rs. lakh)*		
	New	*Old*	*Total*	*New*	*Old*	*Total*		*New*	*Old*	*Total*	*New*	*Old*	*Total*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Durg													
Dondi	76	12	88	—	—	22.88	5.60	—	—	51	—	—	16.06
Balod	88	24	112	—	—	12.97	4.00	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dhamda	198	17	215	—	—	38.99	5.00	—	—	74	—	—	20.78
Raipur													
Baghbahara	20	27	47	2.80	3.24	6.04	5.15	41	21	62	10.97	0.97	11.94
Saraipalli	12	42	54	3.80	3.91	7.71	4.65	24	43	67	9.92	5.21	15.13
Nagri	11	25	36	2.15	4.53	6.68	7.25	37	20	57	2.21	17.10	19.31
Mainpur	31	20	51	3.20	2.81	6.01	8.60	40	31	71	9.45	3.70	13.15

SOURCE: Office of the District Rural Development Agency, Durg District, May 1985.

TABLE 5.3 SUMMARY OF ANNUAL ACTION PLAN OF DURG DISTRICT, 1984-85

Block/Agency	*Incomplete works of 1983-84*		*New works during 1984-85*		*Total*	
	Number	*Amount (Rs. lakh)*	*Number*	*Amount (Rs. lakh)*	*Number*	*Amount (Rs. lakh)*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Durg	15	0.86	218	33.82	233	34.68
Dhamda	17	3.30	198	35.69	215	38.99
Patan	44	4.83	65	15.39	109	20.22
Gunderdehi	61	5.89	130	10.91	191	16.80
Balod	21	1.30	88	11.68	109	12.98
Dondilohara	50	1.80	258	51.03	308	52.83
Dondi	12	1.70	76	19.18	88	20.88
Bemetara	29	1.79	88	19.87	117	21.66
Saja	7	0.92	163	21.28	170	22.20

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Gurur	34	2.10	106	18.53	140	20.63
Barela	15	1.65	126	23.15	141	24.80
Nawagarh	168	16.38	183	40.23	350	56.61
Assistant Engineer, Rural Engineering Service,	15	—	—	—	15	—
Conservator, Forest,	14	7.70	38	17.52	52	25·22
Deputy Director, Social Forestry,	—	—	125	66.39	125	66.39
Executive Engineer, PWD, No. 1,	—	—	6	14.40	6	14.40
Executive Engineer, PWD, No. 2,	1	0.50	10	14.30	11	14.80
Executive Engineer, PWD, Balod	—	—	7	5.75	7	5.75
Executive Engineer, Irrigation, Tandula,	—	—	42	22.00	42	22.00

(*Contd.*)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Executive Engineer, Irrigation, Bemetara	—	—	15	6.55	15	6.55
Executive Engineer, Irrigation, Balod.	—	—	5	5.50	5	5.50
Soil Conservation Officer	—	—	19	1.91	19	1.91
Soil Conservation Officer, Bemetara	—	—	41	6.86	41	6.86
TOTAL	503	50.72	2007	461.94	2510	512.66

SOURCE: Office of the District Rural Development Agency, Durg District, May 1985.

TABLE 5.4 ANNUAL ACTION PLAN, RAIPUR DISTRICT, 1985-86

Block	*Number of incomplete works*	*Amount required for the completion of incomplete works (Rs. lakh)*	*Number of proposed new works*	*Amount required for completion of proposed new works (Rs. lakh)*	*Total number of works*	*Total amount (3+5) (Rs. lakh)*	*Allotment during 1984-85 (Rs. lakh)*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Baghbahara	21	0.97	41	10.97	61	11.94	5.15
Fingeshwar	21	2.40	17	5.75	38	8.15	4.40
Dharsiva	68	6.87	48	19.23	116	26.10	6.96
Pithora	45	4.93	35	4.95	80	9.88	5.99
Gariyaband	32	5.53	31	10.85	63	16.38	10.75
Magarload	39	3.42	27	9.50	66	12.92	3.15
Dhamtari	23	3.27	27	11.60	50	14.87	6.15
Bhatapara	22	3.02	30	15.00	52	18.02	6.02
Aarang	40	5.71	43	7.22	83	12.93	5.68

(Contd.)

Palari	35	4.42	52	10.26	87	14.68	3.90
Chura	27	2.85	37	10.35	64	13.20	7.75
Nagri	20	2.21	37	17.10	57	19.31	7.85
Baloda Bazar	40	2.84	35	13.00	75	15.84	5.15
Tilda	62	8.03	34	15.25	96	23.28	7.95
Kasdol	79	11.61	44	19.67	123	31.28	6.42
Saraipalli	43	5.21	44	19,67	87	24.88	4.15
Kurud	30	5.90	16	6.50	46	12.40	6.40
Mainpur	35	3.70	40	9.45	75	13.15	8.75
Devbhog	28	2.46	25	8.00	53	10.46	3.15
Basana	45	2.92	16	6.15	61	9.07	4.15
Simga	29	4.14	35	10.80	64	14.94	5.15
Abanpur	42	7.67	48	9.92	90	17.59	5.15
Mahasamund	49	2.80	78	11.14	127	13.94	6.65
Bilaigarh	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTAL	875	102.88	840	262.33	1775	365.21	136.82

SOURCE: Office of the District Rural Development Agency, May, 1985.

TABLE 5.5 INCOMPLETE WORKS IN RAIPUR DISTRICT

Block	*Number of incomplete works*	*Allotment required for the completion of works (Rs. lakh)*
(1)	(2)	(3)
Baghbahara	21	0.97
Fingeshwar	21	2.40
Dharsiva	68	6.87
Pithora	45	4.93
Gariyaband	32	5.53
Magarload	39	3.42
Dhamtari	23	3.27
Bhatapara	22	3.02
Aarang	40	5.71
Palari	35	4.42
Chura	27	2.85
Nagri	20	2.21
Baloda Bazar	40	2.84
Tilda	62	8.03
Kasdol	79	11.61
Saraipalli	43	5.21
Kurud	30	5.90
Mainpur	35	3.70
Devhog	28	2.46
Basana	45	2.92
Simga	29	4.14
Abhanpur	42	7.67
Mahasamund	49	2.80
Bilaigarh	—	—
TOTAL	875	102.85

SOURCE: Office of the District Rural Development Agency, Raipur District, May, 1985.

TABLE 5.6 INCOMPLETE WORKS IN DURG DISTRICT, 1985

Block	*Number of incomplete works*	*Allotment required for the completion of works (Rs. lakh)*
Durg	30	4.10
Dhamda	24	1.00
Patan	29	1.80
Gunderdehi	36	4.00
Balod	14	1.50
Gurur	30	3.20
Dondi	19	2.00
Dondilohara	30	3.75
Saja	9	0.50
Bemetara	19	1.80
Nawagarh	70	3.50
Barela	18	3.00
TOTAL	328	30.15

SOURCE: Office of the District Rural Development Agency, Durg District, May 1985.

TABLE 5.7 TYPE OF INCOMPLETE WORKS IN DURG DISTRICT UPTO APRIL, 1985

Block/Agency	*Number of incomplete works*	*Type of incomplete works*										
		Road	*Tank*	*School building*	*Panchayat bhavan*	*Rural secretariat bhavan*	*Recreation hall*	*Well*	*Pulia rapta*	*Social forestry*	*Balbadi*	*Others*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Durg	25	6	1	13	—	—	—	5	—	—	—	—
Dhamda	10	—	—	7	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Patan	32	7	—	15	4	2	—	4	—	—	—	—
Gunderdehi	30	2	2	12	3	1	5	2	—	—	—	3
Bemetara	19	—	—	14	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	2
Saja	9	2	—	5	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1
Barela	18	3	1	11	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	—
Nawagarh	112	14	84	28	17	7	—	12	—	—	1	18

Balod	7	—	—	4	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Gurur	30	2	—	13	2	—	3	6	—	—	—	4
Dondilohara	42	1	4	18	3	—	1	5	2	4	—	2
Dondi	19	1	—	16	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—
Assistant Engineer, (RES)	5	—	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Forest department	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	—	—
Social Forestry department	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
PWD Circle-I	7	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
PWD Circle-II	6	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
PWD Circle-III	5	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Irrigation department	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6
Irrigation department, Bemetara	4	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2

(Contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Irrigation department, Balod	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Soil Conservation	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7
Soil Conservation, Bemetara	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTAL	401	56	94	161	36	10	11	37	2	12	1	47

SOURCE : Office of the District Rural Development Agency, Durg District, May 1985.

Table 5.8 YEARWISE STATEMENT OF INCOMPLETE WORKS IN RAIPUR DISTRICT, 1983-84

Block	*1975-76*	*1976-77*	*1977-78*	*1978-79*	*1979-80*	*1980-81*	*1981-82*	*1982-83*	*1983-84*	*Total*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Dharsiva	—	—	—	6	2	14	16	4	13	55
Aarang	—	1	1	1	—	3	6	5	16	33
Tilda	—	—	—	7	10	18	4	7	13	59
Abhanpur	—	—	—	4	2	8	—	4	18	36
Mahasamund	—	—	—	3	9	13	—	2	17	38
Baghbahara	—	—	3	5	1	2	6	3	7	27
Pithora	—	—	12	9	—	16	8	—	5	50
Basana	—	—	2	10	11	13	1	1	4	42
Saraipalli	—	—	1	4	5	21	—	2	7	40
Dhamtari	—	—	—	—	4	1	3	—	20	28
Kurud	1	1	—	2	—	5	23	—	1	34
Magarload	—	1	3	4	—	8	6	2	3	27
Nagri	—	—	—	4	2	1	—	4	14	25
Baloda Bazar	—	—	—	—	1	24	8	3	17	53
Simga	—	2	—	—	1	2	6	6	1	18
Bhatapara	—	1	—	1	3	5	8	—	7	25
Palari	1	3	1	14	—	4	9	5	2	39
Kasdol	—	—	1	—	17	31	6	1	10	66

(Contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Bilaigarh	—	—	—	—	—	6	2	—	31	39
Gariyaband	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	16	17
Fingeshwar	—	—	5	1	1	3	3	10	3	26
Chura	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	4	11	18
Mainpur	—	—	—	—	—	3	2	4	11	20
Devibhog	—	2	3	4	—	2	1	1	12	25
Forest department	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	48	48
PWD	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	11
TOTAL	2	11	32	79	69	205	119	69	312	898

SOURCE : Office of the District Rural Development Agency, Raipur District, May 1985.

TABLE 5.9 COMPLETE AND INCOMPLETE WORKS OF THE BLOCKS SURVEYED, RAIPUR DISTRICT, MAY 1985

Block	*Incomplete works as on 1.4.84*	*New works started during the year 1984-85*	*Total number of works*	*Works completed during the year 1984-85*	*Remaining works as on 1.4.85*	*Allotment during the year 1984-85 (Rs. lakh)*	*Total expenditure during the year 1984-85 (Rs. lakh)*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Baghbahara	27	4	31	10	21	5.15	5.15
Saraipalli	43	18	61	15	46	4.65	4.65
Nagri	25	10	35	11	24	7.25	7.25
Mainpur	17	32	47	18	31	7.25	7.25

SOURCE : Office of the District Rural Development Agency, Raipur District, May 1985.

TABLE 5.10 NUMBER OF WORKS, EXPENDITURE AND GRANT RECEIVED IN DURG AND RAIPUR DISTRICTS

District/ Block	*Number of works proposed in annual action plan 1984-85*			*Expenditure proposed (Rs.)*			*Total grant received during 1984-85 (Rs. lakh)*
	New	*Old*	*Total*	*New*	*Old*	*Total*	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Durg							
Dondi	76	12	88	—	—	20,88,100	5.60
Balod	88	24	112	—	—	12,97.500	4.00
Dhamda	198	17	215	—	—	38,99,000	5.00
Raipur							
Baghbahara	20	27	47	2,80,000	3,24,540	6,04,540	5.15
Saraipalli	12	42	54	3,80,000	3,91,907	7,71,907	4.65
Nagri	11	25	36	2,15,000	4,53,609	6,68,609	7.25
Mainpur	31	20	51	3,20,000	2,81,955	6,01,955	8.60

TABLE 5.10(a) STATEMENT SHOWING NUMBER OF COMPLETE AND INCOMPLETE WORKS DURING 1984-85 AND 1985-86 IN BLOCKS SURVEYED

District/ Block	*Number of incomplete works as on 1.4.1984*	*New work undertaken during 1984-85*	*Total number of works (2+3)*	*Number of completed works as on 1.4.1985*	*Number of works incomplete as on 1.4.1985*	*Number of works proposed in annual action plan 1985-86*			*Expenditure proposed (Rs. lakh) 1985-86*		
						New	*Old*	*Total*	*New*	*Old*	*Total*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Durg											
Dondi	12	20	32	13	19	—	—	51	—	—	16.06
Balod	23	32	55	31	24	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dhamda	17	31	48	35	13	—	—	74	—	—	20.78
Raipur											
Baghbahara	27	04	31	10	21	41	21	62	10.97	0.97	11.94
Saraipalli	43	18	61	16	45	24	43	67	9.92	5.21	15.13
Nagri	25	09	34	17	17	37	20	57	2.21	17.10	19.31
Mainpur	17	32	49	18	31	40	31	71	3.45	3.70	7.15

SOURCE : Data compiled from the Annual Action Plans of the Blocks Surveyed, May 1985.

TABLE 5.11 ALLOTMENT AND EXPENDITURE TO VARIOUS AGENCIES, DURG DISTRICT, 1984-85

(*Rs. in lakh*)

Block/Agency	*Allotment*	*Expenditure 1984-85*
(1)	(2)	(3)
A. Block		
Durg	6.60	6.50
Dhamda	5.60	5.50
Patan	6.10	5.83
Gunderdehi	11.50	11.50
Bemetara	9.60	9.60
Saja	9.10	9.00
Barela	8.60	8.50
Nawagarh	11.60	11.50
Balod	4.10	4.00
Gurur	4.10	4.00
Dondilohara	6.45	6.35
Dondi	10.60	6.20
TOTAL	93.95 (64.12%)	88.48 (65.87%)
B. Agency		
Rural Engineering Service	7.49 (5.11%)	6.30 (4.30%)
Forest Department	19.82 (13.52%)	19.68 (14.65%)
Public Works Department	13.20 (9.00%)	9.79 (07.28%)
Irrigation Department	6.90 (4.70%)	5.33 (03.96%)
Soil Conservation	2.84 (1.93%)	2.84 (2.11%)
District Panchayat Officer	1.30 (0.88%)	1.30 (0.96%)
DRDA (Reserve)	1.01 (0.68%)	0.60 (0.44%)
TOTAL	52.56 (35.88%)	45.84 (35.13%)
GRAND TOTAL (A and B)	146.51 (100)	134.32 (100)

SOURCE: Data compiled from the Annual Action Plan, 1984-85, office of the District Rural Development Agency, Durg District, May 1985.

TABLE 5.12 STATEMENT SHOWING BLOCK AND AGENCY-WISE ALLOTEMENT AND EXPENDITURE—1984-85 RAIPUR DISTRICT

(*Rs. in lakh*)

Block/Agency	*Allotment*	*Expenditure*
A. Block		
Dharsiva	6.96	6.96
Tilda	7.95	7.95
Abhanpur	5.15	5.15
Aarang	5.68	5.68
Mahasamund	6.65	6.65
Baghbahara	5.15	5.15
Pithora	5.99	5.99
Basana	4.15	4.15
Saraipalli	4.15	4.15
Baloda Bazar	5.15	5.15
Bhatapara	6.02	6.02
Palari	3.90	3.90
Kasdol	6.42	6.42
Bilaigarh	6.65	6.65
Simga	8.15	8.15
Dhamtari	6.15	6.15
Kurud	6.40	6.40
Magarload	3.15	3.15
Nagri	7.25	7.25
Gariyaband	10.75	11.79
Mainpur	8.75	9.79
Chura	7.75	7.75
Devbhog	3.15	3.15
Fingeshwar	4.40	4.40
TOTAL A	145.87 (56.87%)	147.96 (55·10%)
B. Agency		
Forest	38.00 (14.81%)	38.46 (14.32%)
Public Works	69.60 (27.13%)	79.07 (29.44%)
Irrigation	3.00 (1.16%)	3.00 (1.11%)
TOTAL	110.60 (43.1%)	120.53 (44.87%)
GRAND TOTAL (A and B)	256.47 (100)	268.49 (100)

SOURCE : Office of the District Rural Development Agency, Raipur District, May 1985.

TABLE 5.13 TYPE OF WORKS UNDERTAKEN, DURG DISTRICT, MAY 1985

Year	*School building number (percentage)*	*Panchayat bhavan number (percentage)*	*Recretion hall number (percentage)*	*Road number (percentage)*	*Pulia rapta number (percentage)*	*Tank number (percentage)*	*Well number (percentage)*	*Others number (percentage)*	*Total*
1981-82	300 (16.96)	60 (3.39)	18 (1.02)	456 (25.78)	31 (1.75)	490 (27.70)	147 (8.31)	267 (15.09)	1769 (100)
1982-83	136 (10.48)	32 (2.46)	10 (0.77)	429 (33.05)	44 (3.39)	418 (32.20)	133 (10.25)	96 (7.39)	1298 (100)
1983-84	131 (13.08)	24 (2.39)	9 (.09)	193 (19.20)	34 (3.38)	180 (17.91)	202 (20.10)	232 (23.08)	1005 (100)
1984-85	123 (14.19)	25 (2.88)	15 (1.73)	142 (16.38)	2 (0.23)	57 (6.57)	56 (6.46)	447 (51.56)	867 (100)
TOTAL	690 (13.97)	141 (2.85)	52 (1.05)	1220 (24.70)	111 (2.24)	1145 (23.18)	538 (10.89)	1042 (21.09)	4939 (100)

SOURCE : Office of the District Rural Development Agency, Durg District, May 1985.
NOTE : Figures in parenthis indicate percentage.

TABLE 5.14 ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS FROM THE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSIONER TO THE DRDA, DURG DISTRICT, 1984-85

Date	Amount of instalment (Rs.)	Total amount received during the same month (Rs.)	Percentage
18.4.84 18.4.84	7,15,000 65,000	7,80,000	5.90
28.5 84 28.5.84	75,20,000 5,00,000	80,20,000	60.53
18.10.84	75,000	75,000	0.56
19.11.84 19.11.84	20,00,000 1,35,000	21,35,000	16.11
4.2.85 4.2.85 25.2.85	20,000 1,00,000 10,00,000	11,20,000	8.45
8.3.85 20.3.85 26.3.85	5,00,000 1,20,000 5,00,000	11,20,000	8.45
TOTAL	1,32,50,000	1,32,50,000	100

SOURCE : Data collected from the Office of the District Rural Development Agency, May 1985.

TABLE 5.15 PATTERN OF RELEASE OF FUNDS FROM THE DRDA TO THE AGENCIES IN DURG DISTRICT, 1984-85

Agency	*Date*	*Amount (Rs.)*	*Quarterly amount received (Rs.)*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Social Forestry			
Deputy Director	25.6.84	10,00,000	10,00,000
	9.1.85	4,00,000	
	11.3.85	1,40,000	9,40,000
	19.3.85	4,00,000	
Public Works Department			
Executive Engineer, Balod	24.11.84	1,68,625	2,08,075
	24.11.84	39,450	
	9.1.85	1,50,000	
	30.1.85	55,000	
	21.3.85	31,375	2,41,925
	21.3.85	5,550	
Executive Engineer, Durg	19.10.84	2,10,000	5,60,000
	19.10.84	3,50,000	
	9.1.85	1,50,000	
	9.1.85	1,00,000	
	11.3.85	60,000	3,50,000
	11.3.85	40,000	
Irrigation			
Executive Engineer, Balod	12.10.84	67,000	1,00,000
	12.10.84	33,000	
	21.3.85	17,000	50,000
	21.3.85	33,000	
Executive Engineer, Bemetara	19.10.84	1,50,000	1,50,000
	9.1.85	1,00,000	1,00,000
Executive Engineer, Durg	24.1.84	1,50,000	1,50,000

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Soil Conservation Officer, Durg			
	3.10.84	25,000	
	8.10.84	75,000	
	19.10.84	1,25,000	3,25,000
	24.11.84	1,00,000	
	9.1.85	1,00,000	1,00,000
District Panchayat Officer, Durg	21.1.85	1,30,000	1,30,000
Marketing Agencies, Durg	24.7.84	60,000	60,000

SOURCE: Data collected from the Office of District Rural Development Agency. May 1985.

TABLE 5.16 RELEASE OF FUNDS FROM THE DRDA TO THE BLOCKS SURVEYED—1984-85

District/ Block	*Proposed expenditure in the annual action plan (Rs. lakh)*	*Date of release*	*Amount (Rs.)*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Durg			
Dondi	8.50	7.5.84	65,000
		14.6.84	3,50,000
		10.12.84	1,35,000
		28.3.85	10,000
		Total	5,60,000
Balod	12.97	7.5.84	65,000
		4.6.84	3,35,000
		Total	4,00,000
		30.4.85	1,15,000
		23.5.85	35,000
		10.6.85	50,000
		Total	2,00,000
Dhamda	38.99	22.6.84	4,49,000
		25.6.84	1,000
		11.3.85	50,000
		Total	5,00,000
		6.5.85	75,000
		24.5.85	75,000
		6.6.85	1,00,000
		Total	2,50,000
Saraipalli	—		
		11.5.84	50,000
		8.6.84	3,65,000
		14.3.85	50,000
		Total	4,65 000

Contd.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
		26.4.85	1,00,000
		21.5.85	40,000
		24.5.85	18,500
		Total	1,58,500
Baghbahara	—		
		27.4.85	10,000
		29.4.85	50,000
		29.4.85	50,000
		28.5.85	40,000
		Total	1,50,000
Nagri	—	17.5.84	65,000
		8.6.84	6,60,000
		4.2.85	1,00,000
		Total	8,25,000
		25.4.85	1,00,000
		21.5.85	40,000
		19.4.85	10,000
		Total	1,50,000
Mainpur	—		
		22.6.84	6,60,000
		17.1.85	50,000
		19.2.85	1,00,000
		27.3.85	50,000
		Total	8,60,000
		20.5.85	1,10,000
		7.6.85	40,000
		13.6.85	10,000
		Total	1,60,000

SOURCE: Data collected from the Office of District Rural Development Agency, Durg and Raipur Districts, May 1985.

TABLE 5.17 ALLOCATION AND ACTUAL EXPENDITURE, RAIPUR DISTRICT, 1980-81 TO 1984-85

Year	*Allocation (Rs. lakh)*	*Expenditure (Rs. lakh)*	*Mandays generated*
1980-81	31.68	38.21	—
1981-82	142.54	143.94	17,27,315
1982-83	170.33	170.33	6,69,818
1983-84	147.88	118.53	13,17,647
1984-85	253.47	268.43	—
TOTAL	745.90	739.44	37,14,780

SOURCE: Data collected from the Office of the District Rural Development Agency, Raipur District, May 1985.

TABLE 5.18 ALLOCATION AND EXPENDITURE, DURG DISTRICT, 1980-81 TO 1984-85

Year	*Allocation (Rs. lakh)*	*Expenditure (Rs. lakh)*	*Mandays generated*
1980-81	15.96	15.85	2,03,957
1981-82	84.70	85.03	9,72,179
1982-83	181.04	182.29	13,13,605
1983-84	98.39	89.39	6,58,823
1984-85	146.61	134.23	20,13,815
TOTAL	526.70	506.79	51,62,379

SOURCE: Data collected from the Office of District Rural Development Agency, Durg District, May 1985.

TABLE 6.1 WORKS SURVEYED—RAIPUR AND DURG DISTRICTS—1984-85

District/ Block	Gram pancha-yat/Vill-age	Type of scheme	Administrative sanction amount/date (Rs.)	Date of comm-ence-ment	Instalments			Total (Cols. 7 and 8)	Valuation	
					Date	Cash	Food-grains (Rs.)		Date	Amount
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Durg Dondi	Salah/ Salahi	Primary Girls School	40,000 — October 1984	22.9.84	22.9.84	5,000	1 Qt. Wheat (150)	5,150	24.11.84	5,756
					1.10.84	—	5 Qt. Wheat (750)	750	—	—
					27.11.84	8,000	—	8,000	10.2.85	11,545
					12.12.84	6,000	5 Qt. Rice (925)	6,925	27.2.85	16,772
					13.3.85	7,000	5 Qt. Rice (925)	7,925	—	—
					:7.5.85	8,000	—	8,000	—	—
								36,750		

(Contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
	Armur kasa/ Amur-kasa	Gram Pancha-yat Bhavan	44,800 April 1984	18.4.84	18.4.84	15,000	—	15,000	—	—
					2.6.84	5,000	1 Qt. Wheat (150)	5,150	—	—
					20.6.84	5,000	—	5,000	—	—
					16.6.85	2,000	—	2,000	—	—
					23.4.85	8,000	—	8,000	—	—
								35,150		
	Salai	Primary School	40,500 July 1984	22.7.84	22.7.84	5,000	1 Qt. Wheat (150)	5,150	—	—
					1.10.84	—	5 Qt. Wheat (750)	750	—	—
					27.1.85	8,000	—	8,000	—	—
					12.2.85	6,000	4 Qt. Rice (740)	6,740	—	—

				11.3.85	7,000	4 Qt. Rice (740)	7,740	—	—
				27.5.85	8,000	—	8,000	—	—
							36,380		
Khalar	Primary School	40,500 August, 1984	22.8.84	22.8.84	5,000	5 Qt. Wheat (750)	5,750	—	—
				28.11.84	8,000	—	8,000	—	—
				1.1.85	8,000	—	8,000	—	—
				1.2.85	5,000	4 Qt. Rice (740)	5,740	—	—
				15.5.85	3,000		3,000	—	—
							30,490		
Singan-wahi/ Padetola	Primary School	40,500 October 1984	15.10.84	15.10.84	8,000	5 Qt. Wheat (750)	8,750	—	—

(Contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
					15.1.85	5,000	4 Qt. Wheat (600)	5,600	—	—
					14.3.85	5,000	—	5,000	—	—
					7.5.85	10 000	—	10,000	—	—
					12.6.85	8,000	—	8,000	—	—
								37,350		
	Beloda/ Beloda	Primary School	40,500 October, 1984	18.10.84	18.10.84	5,000	5 Qt. Wheat (750)	5,750	—	—
					13.12.84	2,000	—	2,000	—	—
					15.1.85	8,000	4 Qt. Rice (740)	8,740	—	—
					7.5.85	10,000	—	10,000	—	—
								26,490		

Awari/ Marat-tola	Primary School	40,500 November 1984	12.11.84	12.11.84	8,000	5 Qt. Wheat (750)	8,750	—	
				27.1.85	7,000	4 Qt. Rice (740)	7,740	—	—
				14.3.85	3,000	—	3,000	—	—
				15.3.85	10,000	—	10,000	—	—
							29,490		
Awari/ Lakhm-tola	Primary School	40,500 November, 1984	30.11.84	30.11.84	8,000	5 Qt. Wheat (750)	8,750	—	—
				12.1.85	10,000	4 Qt. Rice (740)	10.740	—	—
				7.5.85	7,000	—	7,000	—	—
							26,490		

(*Contd.*)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
	Bambh-ani/ Kusuma-tola	Primary School	40,500 December, 1984	12.12.84	12.12.84	7,000	5 Qt. Wheat (750)	7,750	—	—
					27.1.85	6,000	5 Qt. Rice (925)	6,925	—	—
					—	10,000	—	10,000	—	—
					16.6.85	8,000	5 Qt. Rice (925)	8,925	—	—
								33,600		
	Chikhla-kasa	Middle School	22,000 January, 1985	18.1.85	18.1.85	6,000	10 Qt. Wheat (1500)	7,500	—	—
					20.5.85	5,000	—	5,000	—	—
								12,500		

	Mardel/ Valkasa	Road	25,400 February, 1985	26.2.85	26.2.85	—	20 Qt. Rice (3700)	3,700	—	—
					13.3.85	8,800	—	8,800	—	—
					10.5.85	8,500	—	8,500	—	—
					24.5.85	4,400	—	4,400	—	—
								25,400		
Durg Balod	Jalmala/ Jalmala	Recreation Hall	27,125 23.2.82	10.3.84	21.3.84	ɔ,000	—	5,000	—	—
					24.3.84	15,000	—	15,000	—	—
					28.6.84	7,185	—	7,185	2.6.84	28,000
					Public Contri-bution	815		815		
								28,000		
Durg Dhamda	Jamgaon	Primary Girls School	49,600 1984-85	—	—	--	—	—	—	—
	Kodia/ Dongaria	Well	15,000 25.5.85	27.5.85	27.5.85	10,000	—	10,000	—	—

(Contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
	Pari	Road	50,000 5.6.85	6.6.85	16.6.85	50,000	—	50,000	—	—
	Nawa- gaon/ Salevood	Tank	20,000 1984-85	6.6.85	11.6.85	5,000	—	5,000	—	—
	Achholi/ Achholi	Tank	25,400 1984-85	25.5.85	20.5.85	15,000	—	15,000	—	—
	Malpuri/ Malpuri	Road	17,000 1984-85	18.5.85	20.5.85	10,000	—	10,000	—	—
	Bhatha- kakri	Road	36,700 1984-85	6.5.85	20.5.85 17.6.85	18,350 3,000	—	21,350	—	—
	Devri/ Devri	Road	46,600 1984-85	5.6.85	4.6.85	16,000	— —	30,000 —	— —	— —
					11.6.85	14,000				
	Ghot- wani/ Ghotwani	Tank	28,700 1984-85	12.6.85	11.6.85	7,000	—	7,000	—	—
	Khour- dia/ Dongria	Well	15,700 1984-85	25.5.85	24.5.85	10,000	—	10,000	—	—
	Ronda/ Kanka	Road	18,000 1984-85	15.5.85	4.6.85	10,000	—	10,000	—	—

aipur Baghbahara	Sikripalli	Tank	25,000 12.6.85	16.6.85	—	10,000	—	10,000	—	—
	Sambher	½ km.	8,700	3.6.85	3.6.85	2,000	—	6,960	3.6.85	3,691
		Road	30.5.85		6,6,85	4,960	—	—	6.6.85	4,960
	Tondiguna/	Well	—	31.5.85	1.6.85	4,800	—	9,600	—	—
	Mongriapali		1.5.85		11.6.85	4,800	—			
	Samber	School	—	—	1978	20,000	13 Qt.	21,950	23.5.85	5,197
			23.12.84		13.2.85	33,000	Wheat (1,950)	54,950		
Raipur	Guchapalli	Panchayat	50,000	25.1.85	11.3.85	9,000	7 Qt.	10,050	—	—
Saraipalli		Bhavan	1.1.85		31.1.85	20,000	Wheat		19.6.85	23,000
							(1,050)	30,050		
	Kurmipali/	Primary	50,000	27.1.85	29.1.85	20,000	—	24,000	29.3.85	32,585
	Kalonda	School	24.11.85		29.3.85	4,000				
	Jambhari	Well	22.12.85	8.1.85	9.1.85	4,595	4 Qt. Wheat (600)	5,195	—	14,755
							3 Qt. Rice	555	—	—
								5,750		

(*Contd.*)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
	Temri	Primary School	40,500 17.12.84	5.1.85	24.1.85	20,000	—	40,000	29.3.85	34,198
					29.3.85	4,000	—		—	—
					6.5.85	16,000	—		—	—
Raipur Nagri	Kaspur	Tank	20,000 20.12.84	22.5.85	12.5.85	20,000	—	20,000	4.6.85	20,000
							—		13.6.85	35,800
	Devpur/ Bodhsemera	Primary School (1983-84)	48,300 21.11.84	2.2.84	4.2.84	29,000	—	—	6.5.84	3,694
					3.1.85	—	—	—	2.1.85	18,608
					14.2.85 13.3.85 22.3.85	19,300	—	48,300	—	—
Raipur Mainpur	Gohrapadar	Tank	22,500 21.3.85	—	28.3.85	5,000	—	22,500	7.6.85	17,431
					22.5.85	14,500	—	—	—	—
					10.6.85	3,000	—	—	—	—
Social Forestry										
Raipur Nagri	Sihawa	Bamboo Plantation (20 hect.)	43,000 1983-84							
	Birgudi, Nagri, Risgaon and Sitanadi	Distribution of plants to the poor (5 lakh seedlings)	1,30,000 1983-84							

Raipur Saraipalli	Guchapalli	Panchavan (24 hect.)	16,000 1984-85	
Raipur Dhamda	—	Panchavan (10 hect.)	40,000 1984-85	
PWD				
Raipur Saraipalli	Bodesare Lamper	Road (17.90 km)	82,000 1983-84	12.1.84 to 25.3.84
	Nawaguda	Road (5.40 km)	26,000 1983-84	6.1.84 to 31.3.84
Durg Dondi	Ganphul Jharsoldin	Road (14.89 km)	34,000 1983-84	12.1.84 to 31.3.84
Durg Balod	Rajhara/ Singhanwahi	Road	— 1985-86	

SOURCE: Data collected from the Blocks and Agencies, Durg and Raipur Districts, May 1985.

NOTE : Figures in parentheses indicate total amount of foodgrains.

TABLE 6.2 GRAM PANCHAYATWISE PROFILE OF WORKS UNDER PANCHAYAT SECTOR DONDI BLOCK—DURG DISTRICT, 1980-81 TO 1984-85

Gram panchayat/ number of villages	*Population*	Works undertaken					*Total amount (Rs.)*	*Total number of works*	*Number of incom-plete works*
		1980-81	*1981-82*	*1982-83*	*1983-84*	*1984-85*			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Dondi 2	5,120	—	RH 17,300 PS 29,200	AR (20,000) TD (13,300) AR (4,700) HP (5,000)	—	—	89,500	6	—

Awari 2	2,200	PS(G) (25,000)	—	AR (20,000) GV (20,700) PS (30,000) AR (10,800)	—	PS (40,500) PS (40,500)	1,87,500	6	2
Gudoom 1	1,314	—	—	AR (20,000) TD (11,000) HP (5,000) AR (5,000) MS (36,000)	—	—	77,000	5	—

(*Contd.*)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Kuvagodi 2	1,886	—	AR (20,000)	AR (23,000) AR (36,900) AR (9,800) PS(G) (30,000) PS(G) (30,000)	—	—	1,49,700	6	1
Surdongar 2	1,661	—	PS (29,200)	—	—	PS (40,500)	69,700	2	1
Bamhni 3	1,553	—	—	AR (36,800) HP (5,000) AR (5,000)	—	PS (40,500)	87,300	4	1
Markotola 3	1,300	—	—	TD (10,000) PS (30,000)	PS (35,850)	—	75,850	3	1

Gohtia 2	1,836	—	—	TD (20,000) AR (20,000) W (14,450) PS (26,800)	W (14,450) W (14,450)	—	1,10,150	6	—
Dhobni 2	995	—	—	TD (13,000) TD (13,100)	W (14,450)	—	40,550	3	—
Pachara 3	1,855	AR 13,000	—	TD (5,000) TD (5,000)	—	PS (40,500) TD (42,600)	1,06,100	7	1
Patoli 2	1,394	—	—	PS (30,000) TD (19,990)	—	—	49,900	2	—

(Contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Salai 3	1,759	—	MS (36,000)	AR (14,800) PG (5,000) AR (5,000) TD (13,100) TD (19,700) AR (14,600) HP (5,000)	—	PS(G) (40,500)	1,53,700	9	1
Takadora 2	753	PS 25,000	—	AR (9,900) AR (20,000) AR (14,800)	PS (36,850)	—	1,46,250	9	—

				TD (13,300) TD (16,400) TD (5,000) RG (5,000)					
Adjal	1,315	—	—	TD (10,000) TD (15,600) RG (5,000) HP (5,000) T (31,000)	TD (31,000)	PS(G) (40,500)	1,38,100	7	1

(*Contd.*)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Singala 5	1,678	—	TD (20,000)	TD (10,000) AR (5,000) TD (13,100) AR (20,000) TD (27,500) AR (23,000) PS (32,300)	PS (35,853)	PS (40,500)	2,27,253	10	—
Kotogaon 1	1,408	—	—	AR (20,000) TD (10,700) MS (34,600)	—	PS(G) (40,500)	1,05,800	4	1
Kumarkaha 5	4,310	—	—	MS (34,600)	—	—	34,600	1	—

Armurkasa 3	1,740	—	PS(G) (20,000) RG (5,562)	AD (10,000) AR (20,000) PS (32,300) TD (16,400) RG (5,000) AR (11,800) AR (7,600) PG (5,000)	TD (13,200)	GPB (44,800)	1,91,662	12	1
Pagratola 3	1,209	—	PS (23,000) RH (23,000)	TD (13.700)	TD (10,500) TD (11,500)	—	81,700	5	—

(Contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Khalari 1	1,628	GPB 25,000 PS 25,000	—	AR (11,800) AR (5,000)	AR (19,200) AR (19,200)	PS(G) (40,500)	1,45,700	7	1
Baratola 2	1,510	PS(G) 25,000	GPB Repair (3,221) RH (16,650)	AR (20,000) AR (20,000) HP (5,000) HP (5,000) AR (20.000)	—	PS(G) (40,500)	1,55,371	9	—
Kuchkanhar 3	1,340	—	W (13,600)	TD (19,850) PS (30,000) AR (18,000)	—	—	81,450	4	—

Amadola 3	1,262	—	AR (20,000) SC (40,000) G (31,000) PS(G) (16,000)	AR (15,585) W (13,600)	—	—	1,36.185	6	
Mathena 3	1,211	—	—	TD (2,800) HP (5,000) TD (13,300)	—	—	21,100	3	—
Kondekasa 3	1,342	—	W (13,600) PS (36,000)	PS (19,950) AR (20,000) HP (5,000)	—	—	94,550	5	—

(*Contd.*)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Baloda 4	1,482	PS 25,000	—	TD (13,200) TD (16,400)	AR (19,900)	PS (40,500)	1,15,000	5	1
Chikhly 2	1,466	—	MS (33,300)	TD (13,200)	—	—	46,500	2	—
Suberbond 5	3,366	GPB 25,000	PS (34,800)	AR (20,000) AR (20,000)	—	PS (40,500)	1,40,300	5	—
Demabujurg 3	1,095	C 15,000	MMB (19,500)	AR (20,000) AR (19,990) TD (17,500) AR (19,200)	AR (20,000) AR (20,000)	—	1,51,190	9	—
Borgaon 4	1,050	PSB 25,000	W (13,600)	—	PSB (35,850)	GPB (44,800)	1,19,250	4	—

Kusankasa 1	3,333	—	BB (35,200) PS (30,500)	RG (5,000) HP (5,000) HP (5,000) HP (5,000) HP (5,000)	TD (20,000)	PS(1) (40,500)	1,51,200	9	1
Chiklakasa 2	2,124	AR 2,000	AR (15,000) AR (20,000) AR (20,000) TD (8,750) HP (5,000) HP (5,000)	—	—	MS(A) (22,000)	97,750	7	—

(Contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Gujra 4	2,278	GPB 25,000	—	TD (5,000) TD (5,000) TD (5,000) MS (34,600)	—	—	74,600	5	1
Siragvati 1	1,349	—	MS (37,000)	AR (20,400) TD (14,800) AR (8,850) TD (13,100)	—	PS (40,500)	1,34,650	6	1
Narratola 3	2,119	AR 17,950	SF (5,000)	AR (20,000) AR (20,000) AR (5,000) TD (12,200)	—	—	1,16,150	10	–

				TD (14,700) AR (16,300) HP (5,000)					
Pusaved 4	1,268	—	AR (2,000) PS (29,200)	AR (22,000) GPB (29,900) TD (11,000)	—	—	94,100	5	—
Buratola 3	1,302	GPB 25,000	TD (5,300)	TD (20,000)	—	—	50,300	3	—
Blasbord 1	1,268	PSG 25,000	W (13,600)	— —	-- —	— —	43,600	3	—
Chickrra 2	1,749	PSG 25,000	SF (5000)	—	PS (35,850)	—	60,850	2	—

(*Contd.*)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Bital 5	2,694	—	—	PS (16,800) TD (17,500)	—	—	34,300	2	—
Mardol 5	1,163	PS 25,000	TD (15,000)	PS (30,000)	—	AR (25,400)	95,400	4	1
Balargadhi 2	1,120	—	SF (6,000) PS (21,200)	AR (24,700)	—	—	51,900	2	1
Kharkhi 3	1,692	PS 32,100	SF (5,000)	PS (32,300)	—	—	69,400	3	—

SOURCE: Data collected from Office of the Dandi Block, Durg District, May 1985.

NOTE: Figures in parentheses indicate the cost of the scheme.

Abbreviations:

AR—Approach Road
BB—Balwadi Bhavan
C—Chabutra
GPB—Gram Panchayat Bhavan
GV—Gram Vatika
HP—Hume Pipe
MMB—Mahila Mandal Bhavan
MS(A)—Middle School (Additional Room)
MS—Middle School
PB—Panchayat Bhavan
PG—Play Ground
PS(B)—Primary School (Boys)
PS(G)—Primary School (Girls)
RG—Repair Gali
RH—Recreation Hall
SC—Village Secretariat Complex
SF—Social Forestry
TD—Tank Deepening
W—Well

TABLE 6.3 SCHEMEWISE EXPENDITURE UNDER PANCHAYAT SECTOR, DONDI BLOCK, DURG DISTRICT, 1980-81 TO 1984-85

Category of works	*Total number of works (per cent)*	*Total amount (Rs.) (per cent)*
(1)	(2)	(3)
A. *Building Works*		
Primary School (Girls)	12 (5.38)	3,37,500 (8.98)
Primary School (Boys)	40 (17.93)	6,79,303 (18.07)
Middle School	7 (3.13)	2,46,100 (6.54)
Middle School (Additional Room)	1 (0.44)	22,000 (0.58)
Recreation Hall	4 (1.79)	61,950 (1.64)
Balwadi Bhavan	1 (0.44)	35,200 (0.93)
Mahila Mandal Bhavan	1 (0.44)	19,500 (0.51)
Gram Panchayat Bhavan	7 (3.13)	2,19,500 (5.84)
Gram Panchayat Bhavan (Repair)	1 (0.44)	3,221 (0.08)
Village Secretariat Complex	1 (0.44)	40,000 (1.06)
Godown	1 (0.44)	31,000 (0.82)
Chabutra	2 (0.89)	20,000 (0.53)
TOTAL	78 (34.82)	17,15,274 (45.63)

(Contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)
B. *Earth Works*		
Approach Road	60 (26.90)	10,12,885 (26.95)
Tank	51 (22.86)	7,47,100 (19.87)
Well	9 (4.03)	1,25,800 (3.34)
Hume Pipe	16 (7.17)	80,000 (2.12)
Play Ground	2 (0.89)	10,000 (0.26)
Cali Repair	2 (0.89)	25,562 (0.68)
Social Forestry	4 (1.79)	21,000 (0.55)
Gram Vatika	1 (0.44)	20,700 (0.55)
TOTAL	145 (64.97)	20,43,047 (54.36)
GRAND TOTAL : (A+B)	223 (100)	37,58,321 (100)

SOURCE: Data collected from the Office of Dondi Block, Durg District, May 1985.

TABLE 6.4 EXPENDITUREWISE COVERAGE OF GRAM PANCHAYATS, DONDI BLOCK, DURG DISTRICT 1980-81 TO 1984-85

Expenditure incurred (Rs.)	*Number of gram panchayats*
Less than 40,000	3
40,000— 80,000	12
80,000—1,20,000	14
1,20,000—1,60,000	11
1,60,000—2,00,000	2
2,00,000—2,40,000	1

SOURCE: Data collected from the Office of Dondi Block, Durg District, May 1985.

TABLE 6.5 GRAM PANCHAYATWISE DISTRIBUTION OF WORKS, DONDI BLOCK, DURG DISTRICT, 1980-81 TO 1984-85

Number of works	*Number of gram panchayats*
1	1
2	6
3	6
4	5
5	7
6	6
7	4
8	0
9	5
10	2
11	0
12	1

SOURCE: Data collected from the Office of Dondi Block, Durg District, May 1985.

TABLE 6.6 PANCHAYATWISE DETAILS OF SCHOOL WORKS (MORE THAN ONE) DONDI BLOCK, DURG DISTRICT, 1980-81 TO 1984-85

Gram panchayat/ number of villages	*Population*	*School works during*					*Number of school works undertaken*	*Total number of works under-taken*	*Expenditure on school works (Rs.) (per cent)*	*Total expenditure in gram panchayat (Rs.)*
		1980-81	*1981-82*	*1982-83*	*1983-84*	*1984-85*				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Awari 2	2,200	PSG(1)	—	PS(1)	—	PS(2)	4	6	1,36,000 (72.72)	1,87,000
Kuvagodi 2	1,886	—	—	PSG(2)	—	—	2	6	60,000 (40,08)	1,49,700
Sardongar 2	1,661	—	PS(1)	—	—	PS(1)	2	2	69,700 (100)	69,700
Markatola 3	1,300	—	—	PS(1)	PS(1)	—	2	3	65,850 (86.81)	75,850

Salai 3	1,759	—	MS(1)	—	—	PSG(1)	2	9	76,500 (69.73)	1,09,700
Tokadora 2	753	PS(1)	—	—	PS(1)	—	2	9	61,850 (42.30)	1,46,250
Singola 5	1,678	—	—	PS(1)	PS(1)	PS(1)	3	10	1,08,653 (47.14)	2,28,053
Kotagaon 1	1,408	—	—	MS(1)	—	PSG(1)	2	4	75,100 (70.98)	1,05,800
Khlari 1	1,628	PS(1)	—	—	—	PSG(1)	2	7	65,500 (44.95)	1,45,700
Beratola 2	1,510	PSG(1)	—	—	—	—	2	5	65,500 (42.15)	1,55,371
Kandakasa 3	1,342	—	PS(1)	PS(1)	—	—	2	5	45,950 (48.59)	94,550
Balod 4	1,482	PS(1)	—	—	—	PS(1)	2	5	65,000 (56.52)	1,15,000
Bargaon 4	1,050	PSB(1)	—	PSB(1)	—	—	2	4	60,850 (61.30)	99,250

(Contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Suberbond 5	3,366	—	PS(1)	—	—	PS(1)	2	5	75,300 (54.05)	1,39,300
Kusankasa 1	3,333	—	PS(1)	—	—	PS(1)	2	9	71,000 (46.95)	1,51,200
Chickrra 2	1,749	PSG(1)	—	—	—	PSG(1)	2	2	60,850 (100)	60,850
Mordel 5	1,163	PS(1)	—	PS(1)	—	—	2	4	50,000 (52.41)	95,400
Kharkhai 3	1,692	PS(1)	—	PS(1)	—	—	2	3	64,300 (92.78)	69,300
TOTAL									12,77,903 (58.14)	21,97,974 (100)

SOURCE : Data collected from the Office of the Dondi Block, Durg District, May 1985.

NOTE : Total number of villages: 116. Five Gram Panchayats are without schools. In 20 Panchayats only one school.

Abbreviations :

PS=Primary School.
PSG=Primary School Girls.
PSB=Primary School Boys.
MS=Middle School.

TABLE 6.7 MONTHWISE DISBURSEMENT OF GRANT IN NAGRI, MAINPUR AND BALOD BLOCKS—1984-85

Month	*Nagri* (*Rs.*)	*Mainpur* (*Rs.*)	*Balod* (*Rs.*)
April	—	—	—
May	—	—	—
June	62,550	—	12,600
July	48,594	6,700	23,205
August	—	43,000	31,515
September	9,589	41,500	43,185
October	72,990	27,800	95,278
November	5,000	—	13,700
December	42,324	1,50,000	83,957
January	69,634	3,54,400	19,685
February	1,07,588	1,07,250	41,060
March	4,08,729	1,22,800	35,815
TOTAL	8,26,998	8,53,450	4,00,000

SOURCE: Data collected from the Office of Raipur and Durg Districts, May, 1985.

TABLE 6.8 CASES OF RECOVERY

District/Block	*Number of cases*	*Amount* (*Rs.*)	*Remarks*
Raipur			
Saraipalli	16	33,418	—
Nagri	30	—	30 cases were sent to collector on May 19, 1985. No recovery orders issued.
Baghbahara	—	—	—
Mainpur	3	40,000	3 cases were sent to collector for recovery orders.
Durg			
Balod	12	50,000	Recovery orders issued in cases worth Rs. 30,260.
Dondi	1	12,000	No recovery orders were issued up to June 1985.
Dhamda	—	—	—

SOURCE: Data collected from the Office of Raipur and Durg Districts, May, 1985.

TABLE 6.9 MANDAYS ESTIMATED FOR SCHOOL BUILDING AS SHOWN IN ANNUAL ACTION PLAN, 1985-86

Block	*Work*	*Total cost (Rs.)*	*Material cost (Rs.)*	*Wages*		*Estimated mandays shown in the annual action plan*	*Actual mandays generated*
				Cash (Rs.)	*Foodgrains (Rs.)*		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Durg							
Dondi	Primary School	50,000	30,000	15,773	9,227	2,285	810
Raipur							
Baghbahara	Primary School	50,000	30,000	15,930	4,070	2,200	810
Mainpur	Primary School	50,000	20,000	27,000	3,000	3,000	1,215

SOURCE: Data collected from the Office of Durg and Raipur Districts, Annual Action Plan, 1985-86.

TABLE 6.10 COST OF MATERIALS IN SCHOOL BUILDING

Material	*Quantity*	*Rate (Rs.)*	*Amount (Rs.)*
Bricks	23,000	280	6,440
Stone	$30M^3$	140	4,200
Concrete	$13M^3$	430 }	6,710
Cement	80 Bag	63 }	
Woodwork	100 cft.	120	12,000
Tiles	18,000	135	2,430
Stone	800 sq. ft.	2.50	2,000
Sand	$30M^3$	30	900
Steel	250 kg.	8	2,000
Finishing			1,000
TOTAL			37,680

SOURCE : Office of the Executive Engineer, Rural Engineering Service, Raipur District, May 1985.

TABLE 6.11 MANDAYS ESTIMATED IN CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOL BUILDING

Category	*Number of persons employed*	*Number of days employed*	*Total mandays*	*Wage rate (Rs.)*	*Total wages (Rs.)*
Mason	3	45	135	25,00	3,375
Labourer	12	45	540	09.15	4,941
Carpenter	3	40	120	25.00	3,000
Labourer	3	40	120	09.15	1,098
TOTAL	21	170	910		12,414

SOURCE : Office of the Junior Engineer, Rural Engineering Service, Mainpur Block, Raipur District, May 1985.

TABLE 6.12 COST INDEX IN BUILDING WORKS

Materials/Labour	*Weightage*
A. Materials	
Bricks	16.00
Sand	05.00
Cement	21.00
Stone	06.50
Timber	18.00
Mild Steel	10.00
	76.50
B. Labour	
Mason	08.50
Carpenter	04.00
Coolie/Beldar	11.00
	23.50

SOURCE : Office of the Junior Engineer, Rural Engineering Service, Raipur District, May 1985.

TABLE 6.13 STATEMENT SHOWING TASK AND RATE FOR NREP WORKS

Item of work	*Task for two labourers*	*Payment based on Rs. 7.95*	*Payment based on Rs. 8.75*	*Payment based on Rs. 9.15*	*Task*	*Task rate Rs. 9.15 per day*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Excavation in ordinary soil i/c 50m. free lead 1.5m. Free lift excluding dressing	12'×12'×1=144 cft. =4.1 cum.	15.90	17.50	18.30	4.1 cum	4 45/cum.
Excavation in hard soil i/c. 50 m. Free lead 1.5m. Free lifı exclud-ing dressing	11'×11'×1=121 cft. =13.45 cum.	15.90	17.50	18.30	3.45 cum.	5.30/cum.
Excavation in moorum i/c 50m. Free lead 1.50m. Free lift exclud-ing dressing	10'×9'×1=90 cft. =2.57 cum.	15.90	17.50	18.30	2.57 cum.	7.10/cum.

(*Contd.*)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Dressing of earth moorum for item no. 1 to 3 above	1,333 cft=37.86 cft.	15.90	17.50	18.30	37.86 cu m.	0:50/cu m.
Surface dressing (training uneven surface to a uniform surface depth of cutting 1.5 cm. for ordinary or hard soil)	25 sq m. per day	15.90	17.50	18.30	25 sq m. per day	0.75/sq m.

SOURCE : Office of the Junior Engineer, Rural Engineering Service, Raipur District, May 1985.

TABLE 6.14 LIST OF REVISED RATES

Item	*Increased from 1.1.82 (percentage)*	*Increased from 1.11.84 (percentage)*	*Total increased rate (percentage)*
Brick work	25	25	50
Stone work	25	25	50
Wood work	25	25	50
Concrete work	25	25	50
Flooring work	25	25	50
Plastering	25	25	50
Morters	25	25	50
Roofing	25	25	50
Well excavation	25	25	50
Iron work		25	25
Painting, distempering and white washing		25	25
Collection of material		25	25

SOURCE : Office of the Junior Engineer, Rural Engineering Service, Raipur District, May, 1985.

TABLE 7.1 DETAILS OF CASH AND FOOD GRANTS DISTRIBUTED IN DONDI BLOCK, DURG DISTRICT—1984-85

Gram panchayat	*Estimated cost (Rs.)*	*Date of release of instalments*	*Allotted amount (Rs.)*		*Total (Col. 4 and 5)*
			Foodgrains cost (Rs.)/ Qty.	*Cash*	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Singola	Primary	14.2.84	—	12,000	
	Shalabhavan	12.3.84	—	10,000	
	35,850	7.6.84	—	6,000	
		25.6.84	—	5,000	
		13.12.84	—	2,540	35,540
Chipra	Primary	1.2.84	—	12,000	
	Shalabhavan	12.3.84	—	10,000	
	35,850	2.6.84	150 (1 Qt. Wheat)	6,000	
		6.7.84	—	5,000	
		6.8.84	—	2,000	
		4.7.84	150 (1 Qt. Wheat)	550	35,850

Tekadora	Primary Shalabhavan 35,850	2.2.84	—	12,000	35,840
		12.3.84	—	8,000	
		2.6.84	150 (1 Qt. Wheat)	6,000	
		18.6.84	—	6,000	
		20.7.84	—	3,000	
		7.8.84	150 (1 Qt. Wheat)	—	
		10.8.84	—	540	
Aamudula	Village Secretariat Bhavan 41,800	23.1.82	—	10,000	41,000
		26.2.82	—	10,000	
		16.6.82	—	4,000	
		16.3.83	—	10,000	
		26.3.84	—	4,000	
		27.11.84	—	2,000	
		27.3.85	—	1,000	
Pusavand	Panchayat Bhavan 29,900	5.2.83	—	10,000	29,500
		5.3.83	—	10,000	
		30.4.83	—	5,000	
		7.12.84	—	2,000	
		7.5.84	—	2,500	

(Contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Boargaon	Panchayat Bhavan 44,800	12.4.84	—	15,000	43,890
		22.5.84	—	5,000	
		18.6.84	150 (1 Qt. Wheat)	5,000	
		5.7.84	—	10,000	
		15.10.84	—	5,000	
		16.2.85	740 (4 Qt. Rice)	3,000	
		15.5.85	—	700	
Kusumkasa	Primary School 40,500	22.9.84	150 (1 Qt. Wheat)	5,000	37,940
		1.10.84	750 (5 Qt. Wheat)	5,000	
		26.11.84	—	8,000	
		27.12.84	300 (2 Qt. Wheat)	8,000	
		18.1.85	740 (4 Qt. Rice)	6,000	
		12.2.85	—	4,000	

Suvarroad	Primary School 40,500	25.7.84	150 (1 Qt. Wheat)	5,000	
		1.10.84	750 (5 Qt. Wheat)	—	
		23.10.84	--	8,000	
		1.1.85	—	8,000	
		28.1.85	740 (4 Qt. Rice)	6,000	40,130
		26.2.85	740 (4 Qt. Rice)	8,000	
		27.3.85	—	2,750	
Barijola	Primary School 40,500	26.7.84	750 (5 Qt. Wheat)	8,000	
		1.1.85	—	10,000	
		23.1.85	740 (4 Qt. Rice)	8,000	
		12.2.85	—	10,000	39,510
		27.3.85	—	2,020	
Pacheda	Tank Deepening 42,700	26.11.84	450 (3 Qt. Wheat)	8,000	
		18.12.84	—	12,000	
		3.1.85	750 (5 Qt. Wheat)	13,000	
		1.2.85	—	4,000	38,200

(*Contd.*)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Markatola	Primary School 38,850	1.2.84	—	12,000	
		17.3.84	—	5,000	
		26.3.84	150 (1 Qt. Wheat)	5,000	
		2.6.84	150 (1 Qt. Wheat)	4,000	34,600
		13.7.84	300 (2 Qt. Wheat)	8,000	
Demabujarag	Primary School 35,850	14.2.84	—	12,000	
		14.3.84	—	10,000	
		2.6.84	150 (1 Qt. Wheat)	5,000	
		23.6.84	—	8,000	35,800
		10.6.84	150 (1 Qt. Wheat)	500	
Belarmodi	Primary Shalabhavan 27,200	25.3.84	—	12,000	
		16.11.84	300 (2 Qt. Wheat)	5,000	
		18.1.85	740 (4 Qt. Rice)	2,000	
		13.2.85	—	4,000	
		17.2.85	—	3,000	
		8.5.85	—	1,800	28,840

Kuakodi	Primary School (Girls) 30,000	27.2.84	—	10,000	30,000
		3.3.84	—	10,000	
		30.4.84	—	6,000	
		8.1.85	—	3,000	
		14.3.85	—	1,000	
Guzara	Middle School 34,600	12.1.83	—	10,000	30,000
		30.4.83	—	10,000	
		14.3.84	—	10,000	
Aamadula	Well 13,600	1.1.83	—	5,000	7,000
		24.5.83	—	2,000	
Armurkasa	Gram Panchayat Bhavan 44,800	18.4.84	—	15,000	35,150
		2.6.84	150 (1 Qt. Wheat)	5,000	
		20.6.84	—	5,000	
		16.1.85	—	2,000	
		23.4.85	—	8,000	
Salai	Primary School (Girls) 40,500	22.7.84	150 (1 Qt. Wheat)	5,000	
		1.10.84	750 (5 Qt. Wheat)	—	

(Contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		27.11.84	—	8,000	36,380
		12.2.85	740 (4 Qt. Rice)	6,000	
		11.3.85	740 (4 Qt. Rice)	7,000	
		27.5.85	—	8,000	
Khalari	Primary School (Girls) 40,500	22.8.84	750 (5 Qt. Wheat)	5,000	
		28.11.84	—	8,000	
		1.1.85	—	8,000	30,490
		1.2.85	740 (4 Qt. Rice)	5,000	
		15.5.85	—	3,000	
Kota	Primary School (Girls) 40,500	15.10.84	750 (5 Qt. Wheat)	8,000	
		12.12.84	—	5,000	
		15.1.85	—	7,000	37,725

		13.3.85	925 (5 Qt. Rice)	7,000	
		28.3 85	1,050 (7 Qt. Wheat)	8,000	
Singanwahi	Primary School (Girls) 40,500	15.10:84	750 (5 Qt. Wheat)	8,000	
		15.1.85	740 (4 Qt. Rice)	5,000	
		14.3.85	—	5,000	37,490
		7.5.85	—	10,000	
		12.6.85	—	8,000	
Arhjal	Primary School 40,500	15.7.84	150 (1 Qt. Wheat)	5,000	
		1.10.84	750 (5 Qt. Wheat)	—	
		27.11.84	—	7,000	
		1.1.85	—	8,000	
		31.1.85	740 (4 Qt. Rice)	6,000	38,640
		13.3.85	—	5,000	
		8,5.85	—	6,000	

(Contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Singola	Primary School 40,500	15.10.84	925 (5 Qt. Rice)	8,000	
		14.12.84	—	7,000	
		15.1.85	740 (4. Qt. Rice)	8,000	37,665
		13 3.85	—	7,000	
		15.5.85	—	6,000	
Beloda	Primary School 40,500	18.10.84	925 (5 Qt. Rice)	5,000	
		13.12.84	—	2,000	
		15.1.85	740 (4 Qt. Rice)	8,000	26,665
		7.5.85	—	10,000	
Pacheda	Primary School 40,500	15.10.84	750 (5 Qt. Wheat)	8,000	
		7.12.84	—	10,000	
		3,1.85	740 (4 Qt. Rice)	7,000	38,490
		22.3.85	—	6,000	
		8.5.85	—	6,000	

Aawari	Primary School 40,500	12.11.84	925 (5 Qt. Rice)	8,000	29,665
		27.1.85	740 (4 Qt. Rice)	7,000	
		14.3.85	—	3,000	
		15.3.85	—	10,000	
Aawari	Primary School 40,500	30.11.84	925 (5 Qt. Rice)	8,000	26,665
		12.1.85	740 (4 Qt. Wheat)	10,000	
		7.5.85	—	7,000	
Bambhani	Primary School 40,500	12.12.84	750 (5 Qt. Wheat)	7,000	26,600
		27.1.85	925 (5 Qt. Rice)	6,000	
		28.3.85	—	10,000	
		16.6.85	925 (5 Qt. Rice)	8,000	
Surdogar	Primary School 40,500	2.1.85	925 (5 Qt. Rice)	8,000	33,775
		12.2.85	925 (5 Qt. Rice)	8,000	

(Contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		15.10.85	—	8.000	
		16.6.85	925 (5 Qt. Rice)	7,000	
Chikhlakara	Middle School 22,000	18.1.85	1,850 (10 Qt. Rice)	6,000	
		20.5.85	—	5,000	12,850
Mardel	Forest Road 25,400	26.2.85	3,700 (20 Qt. Rice)	—	
		13.3.85	—	8,800	
		10.5.85	—	8,500	25,400
		24.5.85	—	4,400	

SOURCE : Data collected from the office of Dondi Block, Durg District, May 1985.

TABLE 7.2 PAYMENT OF WAGES

N=200

Mode of payment	*Durg district*			*Raipur district*				*Total*	*Percentage*
	Dondi	*Balod*	*Dhamda*	*Baghbahara*	*Saraipalli*	*Nagri*	*Mainpur*		
Cash	—	15	—	40	30	—	—	85	42.5
Cash+Foodgrains*	10	—	40	—	—	—	—	50	25.0
No Payment	—	—	—	—	—	35	30	65	32.5
TOTAL	10	15	40	40	30	35	30	200	100.0

*Distribution of foodgrains deferred till its availability and cash component was only paid.

TABLE 7.3 ALLOTMENT OF FOODGRAINS BY THE DRDA, RAIPUR DISTRICT DURING JUNE 1985

Sub-divisional officer (civil)	*Quantity of rice allotted (in mt.)*	*Agency and block*	*Quantity of rice earmarked to the executing agency (in mt.)*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Raipur	95	Deputy Director, Social Forestry, Raipur	40
		Executive Engineer, PWD, Raipur-I.	10
		Executive Engineer, PWD, Raipur-II.	5
		Dharsiva	10
		Tilda	10
		Aarang	10
		Abhanpur	10
TOTAL			95
Baloda Bazar	80	Executive Engineer, PWD-II.	15
		Deputry Director, Social Forestry, Raipur	5
		Baloda Bazar	10
		Palari	10
		Simga	10
		Bhatapara	10
		Kasdol	10
		Bilaigarh	10
TOTAL			80

(Contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Mahasamund	90	Executive Engineer, PWD Mahasamund.	20
		Deputy Director, Social Forestry, Raipur	20
		Mahasamund	10
		Baghbahara	10
		Pithora	10
		Basna	10
		Saraipalli	10
TOTAL			90
Dhamtari	60	Executive Engineer, PWD, Dhamtari	20
		Dhamtari	10
		Kurud	10
		Nagri	10
		Magarload	10
TOTAL			60
Gariyaband	75	Executive Engineer, PWD, Raipur-I.	10
		Deputy Director, Social Forestry, Raipur	15
		Gariyaband	10
		Chura	10
		Fingeshwar	10
		Mainpur	10
		Devbhog	10
TOTAL			75

SOURCE: Data collected from the Office of the District Rural Development Agency, Raipur District, May, 1985.

TABLE 7.4 CENTREWISE ALLOTMENT OF FOODGRAINS IN RAIPUR DISTRICT DURING JUNE 1985

Base centre of FCI	*Stock position of raw rice (mt.)*	*Quantity of raw rice required at the centre (mt.)*	*Quantity allotted to Sub-divisional officer (mt.)*
Raipur I	1,646	95	95, Raipur
Raipur II	33	—	95, Raipur
Rajim	37	75	75, Gariyaband
Dhamtari	60	60	60, Dhamtari
		90	90, Mahasamund
		80	80, Baloda Bazar
TOTAL	1,776	400	495

SOURCE : Data collected from the Office of the Rural Development Agency, Raipur District, June 1985.

TABLE 7.5 REVISED CENTREWISE BREAK UP OF FOODGRAINS ALLOTMENT IN RAIPUR DISTRICT DURING JUNE 1985

Allotment of rice to Sub-divisional officer (civil) (mt.)	*Stock position of rice in FCI depot (mt.)*
Raipur, 95	Raipur 1646 Nedra 33
Gariyaband, 75	Rajim 37
Dhamtari, 60	Dhamtari 60
Mahasamund, 90	Mahasamund —
Baloda Bazar, 80	Raipur 1645

TABLE 8.1 CASTE COMPOSITION OF BENEFICIARIES

N=200

Caste	*Durg district*			*Raipur district*				*Total*	*Percentage*
	Dondi	*Balod*	*Dhamda*	*Baghbahara*	*Saraipalli*	*Nagri*	*Mainpur*		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Scheduled Castes	—	5	—	20	25	—	—	50	25
Scheduled Tribes	10	10	40	15	5	35	30	145	72.5
Others	—	—	—	5	—	—	—	5	2.5
TOTAL	10	15	40	40	30	35	30	200	100.0

TABLE 8.2 LAND-HOLDING PATTERN OF BENEFICIARIES

N=200

Land-holding (in acres)	Durg district			Raipur district				Total	Percentage
	Dondi	Balod	Dhamda	Baghbahara	Saraipalli	Nagri	Mainpur		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Landless	0	15	30	30	10	15	25	125	62.5
Less than 5	5	—	10	5	15	15	5	55	27.5
Less than 10	5	—	—	5	5	5	—	20	10.0
TOTAL	10	15	40	40	30	35	30	200	100.0

TABLE 8.3 SEX COMPOSITION OF BENEFICIARIES

N=200

Sex	*Durg district*			*Raipur district*				*Total*	*Percentage*
	Dondi	*Balod*	*Dhamda*	*Baghbahara*	*Saraipalli*	*Nagri*	*Mainpur*		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Male	5	10	20	22	22	28	24	131	65.5
Female	5	5	15	17	6	7	5	60	30.0
Children	—	—	5	1	2	—	1	9	4.5
TOTAL	10	15	40	40	30	35	30	200	100.0

TATLE 8.4 EMPLOYMENT PROVIDED TO BENEFICIARIES

N=200

Duration	*Durg district*			*Raipur district*				*Total*	*Percentage*
	Dondi	*Balod*	*Dhamda*	*Baghbahara*	*Saraipalli*	*Nagri*	*Mainpur*		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Upto one week	—	—	—	15	—	—	—	15	7.5
Upto two weeks	10	15	10	—	10	5	30	80	40.0
Upto three weeks	—	—	10	10	10	30	—	60	30.0
Upto four weeks	—	—	20	15	10	—	—	45	22.5
TOTAL	10	15	40	40	30	35	30	200	100.0

A SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles

ABRAHAM, A. Maharashtra's Employment Guarantee Scheme. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (August 9, 1980) 1339-42.

AHLUWALIA, M.S. Rural Poverty and Agricultural Performance in India. *Journal of Development Studies*, 14: 3 (April, 1978) 298-323.

APTE, D.P. Crash Scheme for Rural Employment, Evaluation of the Programme in a District in Maharashtra. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (March 24, 1973) 595-600.

APTE, D.P. Organisational and Structural Problems in Implementing Employment Schemes: Some Observations from the Crash Scheme for Rural Employment. *Development Policy and Administration Review*, 4: 2 (July-December, 1978) 37-43.

ARNDT, H.W. The Trickle-Down Myth. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 32 : 1 (October, 1983) 1-10.

BAGCHEE, A.K. Some Implications of Unemployment in Rural Areas. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (Special Number, 1973) 1501-10.

BAGCHEE, S. Employment Guarantee Scheme in Maharashtra. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (September 15, 1984) 1633-8.

BAGCHEE, S. Poverty Alleviation Programmes in Seventh Plan: An Appraisal. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (January 24, 1987) 139-48.

BAHADUR, P. Some Aspects of Rural Under-employment. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, (January, 1962) 318-32.

BANDYOPADHYAY, J. Political Ecology of Drought and Water Scarcity: Need for an Ecological Water Resources Policy. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (December 12, 1987), 2159-69.

BARDHAN, P.K. On the minimum level of living and the rural poor. *Indian Economic Review*, (April 5, 1970) 129-36.

BASU, K. Food for Work Programme: Beyond Roads, that Get Washed Away. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (January 3, 1981) 37-40.

BASU, K. Food for Work—Some Economic and Political Consequences. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (March 27, 1982) A-9-14.

BHADURI, A. Agricultural Backwardness Under Semi-Feudalism. *Economic Journal*, (March, 1973) 120-37.

BUNKER, D.R. Policy Sciences Perspective on Implementation Processes. *Policy Sciences*, 3 (1972) 71-80.

CAIN, M. Landlessness in India and Bangladesh: A Critical Review

of National Data Source. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 32: 1 (October, 1983) 149-67.

CHAKRAVARTY, S. Mahalanobis and Contemporary: Issues in Development Planning, *Sankhya*, 37, (Series, C pt. 2), (1975) 1-11.

CHAKRAVARTY, S. Some Observations on Employment Oriental Planning. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 16: 4 (January, 1974) 303-13.

DANDEKAR, K. and K. Sathe, Employment Guarantee Scheme and Food for Work Programme. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (April 12, 1980) 707-13.

DANDEKAR, V.M. and Rath, Agriculture, Employment and Poverty. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (September 20, 1986) A90-A100.

DANDEKAR, V.M. and Rath, Below the Poverty Line. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (Annual No. February, 1979) 233-36.

DANTWALA, M.L. Rural Employment: Facts and Issues. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (June 23, 1978) 1048-57.

DANTWALA, M.L. 'Garibi Hatao': Strategy Options. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (March 16, 1965) 475-76.

DESAI, V.V. PIREP: A Spatial Approach to Rural Unemployment. *Kurukshetra*, (November 1, 1975) 9-11.

ELIJAH, M. James. Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour After Three Decades. *Asian Economic Review*, 19: 1 (April, 1987) 23-32.

ENKE, S. Economic Development with Unlimited and Limited Supplies of Labour. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 14: 2 (June, 1962) 158-72.

FRANK, Andre Guander. The Wealth and Poverty of Nations, Even hereties remain bound by traditional thought. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (Special Number, July 8, 1970) 1177-84.

GEORGE, P.L. Poverty and Unemployment in Rural India. *Kurukshetra*, (April 1, 1980) 13-26.

GHOSH, D.N. Poverty Alleviation Programmes: Financial Bodies Must be Sound. *State Bank of India Monthly Review*, 21: 6 (June, 1986) 279-93.

GUADE, J. and N. Phan-Thuy, and C. Van Kempten, Evaluation of Special Public Works Programme: Some Policy Conclusions. *International Labour Review*, 123 : 2 (March-April, 1984) 203-19.

GUHAN, S. Rural Poverty: Policy and Play Acting. *Economic and Potilical Weekly*, (November 1, 1980) 1975-82.

GUPTA, M. Employment Programmes need proper direction. *Yojana*, (February 16, 1985) 4-11.

GUPTA, R. Rural Works Programmes: Where it has gone astray. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (May 15, 1971) 995-1004.

GUPTA, S.P. and K.L. Datta. Poverty Calculation in the Sixth Plan. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (April 14, 1984) 632-38.

HANUMANTHA RAO, C.H. et. al. Poverty Eradication in India by

the year 2000: Some Macroeconomic Implications. *Man and Development*, (December 7, 1985) 29-37.

HIRWAY, Indira, 'Garibi Hatao': Can IRIP Do It? *Economic and Political Weekly*, (March 30, 1985) 561-64.

JAIN, M.H. Employment Guarantee Scheme: An Evaluation. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (December 6, 1980) 2043-45.

JODHA, N.S. Special Programmes for the Rural Poor: The Constraining Framework. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (March 31, 1973) 633-39.

JOHNSTON, Bruce F. and John W. Mallor. The Role of Agriculture in Economic Development. *American Economic Review*, (September, 1961) 566-93.

JOSHI, P.C. Land reform in India and Pakistan. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (December, 1970) A145-A152.

JOSHI, P.C. Perspectives on Poverty and Social Change. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (Annual No. February, 1979) 355-66.

JORGENSON, D.W. The Development of a Dual Economy. *Economic Journal*, 71 (1961) 309-35.

'KEY Results of the last three Quinquennial Enquiries on Employment and Unemployment, Sarvashana NSS, 38th Round, (January-December 1983), 9: 4 (April, 1986) S103-213.

KHAN, M.Y. Crash Scheme for Rural Employment: A Review. *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*, (April, 1976) 259-69.

KRISHNA, R. Unemployment in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (March 3, 1973) 475-84.

KRISHNAJI, N, T.N. Krishnan, and K.N. Raj. Guidelines to Financing the Schemes under the Proposed Labour-cum-Development Bank. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 16: 4 (January, 1974) 314-19.

KRISHNAKUMAR, S. Labour-cum-Development Bank. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 15:3-4 (October 1972-January 1973) 291-308.

KURIEN, C.T. What is Growth?—Some Thoughts on the Economic of 'Garibi Hatao'. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (December 23, 1972) 2493-97.

LEVINE, R.A. Rethinking our Social Strategies. *Public Interest*, (Winter, 1968) 86-96.

LEWIS, J.P. The Public-Works Approach to Low-End Poverty Problem: The New Potentialities of an Old Anser. *Journal of Development Planning*, 5 (1972) 85-114.

LIPTON, M. Conditions of Poverty Groups and Impact on Indian Economic Development and Cultural Change—The Role of Labour. *Development and Change*, 15 (1984) 473-93.

LLYOD, R. The Spread of Economic Growth of the Third World: 1850-1980. *Journal of Economic Literature*, (September 21, 1983).

MEHRA, S. Surplus Labour in Indian Agriculture. *Indian Economic Review*, 1 : 1 (April, 1966) 111-29.

OZHA, P.D. A Configuration of Indian Poverty, Inequality and Levels of Living. *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*, 24:1 (January, 1970) 16-27.

PAGLIN, M. Surplus Agricultural Labour and Development. *American Economic Review*, (1965) 815-34.

PANDE, M.K. Productivity Aspect of Wages in Food for Work Programme. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (May 16, 1981) 922-23.

PARTHSARATHI, G. and G.D. Rama Rao. Minimum Wages Legislation for Agricultural Labour. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (September, 1975) A76-A88.

PAUL, S. Strategic Management of Development Programmes: Guidelines for Action. *International Labour Office*: Geneva (1983).

RAJ, K.N. Employment and Unemployment in the Indian Economy: Problems of Classification, Measurement and Policy. *Economic and Cultural Change*, (April, 1959) 258-78.

RAJ, K.N. Employment Creation through a Labour and Development Bank, A Note. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 15:3-4, (October 1972-January 1973) 286-90.

RAJ, K.N. Poverty, Politics and Development. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (Annual No. February, 1977) 195-204.

RAJ, K.N. Reduction in Poverty. *Indian Express*, (January 9, 1984).

RAJ, K.N. Trends in Rural Unemployment in India: An Analysis with Reference to Conceptual and Measurement Problems. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (Special No. August, 1976) 1281-92.

RANGASAMI, A. Financing Famine Belief-Calling a Bluff. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (November 9, 1974) 1985-88.

RANGASAMI, A. The Uses of 'Drought'. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (14 December, 1974) 2069-74.

RANIS, Gwetav. Industrial Sector Labour Absorption. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 21 (April, 1973) 387-408.

RAO, C.H. Hanumantha, Changes in Rural Poverty in India: Implications for Agricultural Growth. *IASSI Quarterly Newsletter*, 4:3:4 (December, 1985) 7-14.

RAO, S.K. Measurement of Unemployment in Rural India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (September, 1973) A78-A90.

RAO, S.K. and A. Sanyal On Promoting Employment through Labour-Intensity of Technique. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (Annual Number 1978) 287-90.

RATH, N. Garibi Hatao: Can IRIP Do It. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (February 9, 1985) 238-46.

RATH, N. Limitations of IRIP as a Programme for the Poor, *IASSI Quarterly Newsletter*, 4:1-2 (June, 1985) 17-20.

REDDY, D.N. A Note on Employment Guarantee Scheme: The Maharashtra Experience and Lessons. *Indian Journal of Labo Economics*, 24:4 (January, 1982) 141-44.

RIEGER, H.C. Bureaucracy and the Implementation of Economic

Plans in India. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 14:1 (January-March, 1967) 33-11.

RITALE, R.L. Employment Guarantee Scheme. *Economic Times*, (August 22, 1980).

RODA, R. Disguised Unemployment and Underemployment in Agriculture. *Monthly Bulletin in Agricultural Economic and Statistics*, Rome. FAO, (July-August, 1957).

RODGERS, G.B. Effects of Public Works on Rural Poverty: Some Case Studies from the Kosi Area of Bihar. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (February 4, 1973) 255-68.

RUDRA, A. One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (June, 1981), A61-A68.

RUTTAN, V.W. The green revolution: seven generalizations. *International Development Review*, 19:4 (August, 1977) 16-23.

SABATIER, P.A. and Mazmanian. Policy Implementation: A framework of analysis. *Policy Studies Journal*, 8 (1980) 538-60.

SAU, R. On Rural .Poverty. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (December 25, 1971) 2463-64.

SAU, R. Poverty in India: A Comment. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (March 20, 1971) 679-80.

SEERS, D. The Meaning of Development. *International Development Review*, 2:9 (1969) 2-6.

SEN, A.K. Public Action and the Quality of Life in Developing Countries. *Oxford Bulletin of Economic and Statistics*, 43:4 (November, 1981) 287-319.

SETHURAMAN, S.V. Measuring Rural Unemployment: Guidelines to Policy Makers. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (June 12, 1971) 1186-91.

SHIBLI, M.A. Food for Work Programme: Beyond Roads The Get Washed Away: A Comment. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (May 30, 1981) 994-96.

SHIVENAGGI, H.B. The Agricultural Labour Problem: Past Misconceptions and Non-Guidelines. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (March 29, 1969), A41-A49.

SINGH, S.P. and P.K. Sinha. Special Employment Scheme for Weaker Sections. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 24:4 (January, 1982) 145-59.

SMITH, T.B. The Policy Implementation Process. *Policy Science*, 4 (1973) 197-99.

STATE Planning Board, Government of Kerala. A Report on the Working of the Labour-cum-Development Bank, Eranakulam. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 16:4 (January, 1974) 320-49.

SUBBARAO, K. Regional Variations in the Impact of Anti-Poverty Programme: A Review of Evidence. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (October 26, 1985) 1829-34.

SUD, S. Rural Employment Schemes—Learning from Past Mistakes. *Times of India* (August 1 and 2, 1977).

TILVES, S. and V. Pitre. Employment Guarantee Scheme and Food for Work Programme: A Comment. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (November 22, 1980) 1988-89.

TYAGI, D.S. How valid are the estimates of trends in rural poverty? *Economic and Political Weekly*, (June 26, 1982) A54-A62.

VAN METER, D.S. and C.E. Van Horn. The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework, *Administration and Society*, 1:4 (February, 1975), 452.

VISARIA, P. and L. Visaria. Employment Planning for the Weaker Sections in Rural India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (Annual Number, February, 1973) A269-A276.

VYAS, V.S. and M. George. Farm and Non-Farm Employment in Rural Areas. *Economic and Political Weekly*, (Annual Number, February, 1978) 333-47.

VYAS, V.S. Some Aspects of Structural Change in Indian Agriculture. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 34:1 (1979) 1-18.

WITTROCK, B. and P. Delecan. Policy as a Moving Target. A Call for Conceptual Realism, *Policy Studies Review*, 6:1 (August, 1986) 47.

WOOD, G. Targets Strike Back-Rural Works Claimants in Bangladesh. *Development and Change*, 16 (1985) 451-73.

Books

ADELMAN, Irma. *Economic Growth and Social Equity in Developing Countries*. Standford: Standford University Press. 1973.

AGARWALA, A.N. and S.P. Singh. (eds.), *The Economics of Underdevelopment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958.

AHLUWALIA, M.S. *Growth and Poverty in Developing Countries*. World Bank Staff Working Paper No. 309, Washington D.C., World Bank, 1979.

AHLUWALIA, M.S. *Rural Poverty in India 1956-57 to 1973-74*. (World Bank Staff Working Paper No. 279), Washington D.C., World Bank, 1978.

AHUJA, Kanta. *Ideal Labour in Village India*. Jaipur Manohar, 1978.

ASIAN Employment Programme. *Expansion of Employment Through Local Resources Mobilization*. Bangkok: ILO, 1982.

BAGCHI, A.K. *The Political Economy of Underdevelopment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

BALOGH, T. Agricultural and Economic Development, Linked Public Works. *Oxford Economic Papers*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (February, 1961), 27-4.

BALOGH, T. *Some Aspects of Economic Growth of Under-developed Areas*. New Delhi: National Council of Applied Economic Research, May 1962.

BANDYOPADHYAY, D. An Evaluation of Policies and Programmes

for the Alleviation of Rural Poverty in India: Strategy for Alleviating Poverty in Rural Asia; edited by Rizwawul Islam, International Labour Organisation, 1985.

BARDHAN, P.K. *Economic Growth, Poverty and Rural Labour Markets in India, A Survey of Research*, International Labour Organisation, 1983.

BARDHAN, P.K. *The Green Revolution and Agricultural Labourers in some problems of Indian Economic Policy*, edited by Charan D. Wadhva. New Delhi: Tata Mcgraw Hill, 1977.

BARDHAN, P.K. *The Political Economy of Development in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1984.

BATCHELDER. A.B. *The Economics of Poverty*, New York : John Willey, 1971.

BHATIA, B.M. *Famines in India, 1860-1965*. (2nd Edn.) Bombay: Asia, 1967.

CHAKRAVARTY, S. *Development Planning: The Indian Experience*. New Delhi: Oxford, 1987.

CHAUDHARI, P. *The Indian Economy, Poverty and Development*. New Delhi: Vikas, 1982.

CHENERY, H.B. and Others. *Redistribution with Growth*. London: Oxford University Press, 1974.

CONNEL, N. and M. Lipton. *Assessing Village' Labour Situation in Developing Countries*. London: Oxford University Press, 1977.

DANDEKAR, V.M. and M. Rath. *Poverty in India*. Bombay: Indian School of Political Economy, 1971.

DANTWALA, M.L. *Definition of Unemployment and Problems of Its Measurement in Developing Countries*. In the Challenge of Unemployment to Development and the Role of Training and Research Institute in Development. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1971.

DANTWALA, M.L. and Y. Pravin, "Rural Labour Force and Employment Policy", in *Economic Theory and Planning*. Edited by Mitra Ashok. Calcutta: Oxford University Press, 1974.

DASGUPTA, A.K. *Planning and Economic Growth*. London, 1964.

EDWARDS, Edgar O. *Employment in Developing Nations: Report on a Ford Foundation Study*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.

EDWARDS, G.C. *Implementing Public Policy*. Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1980.

ELLIETT, C. *Patterns of Poverty in the Third World*. New York: Praeger, 1975.

FIELDS, G.S. *Poverty, Inequality and Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

FRANKAL, F.R. *India's Green Revolution—Economic Gains and Political Costs*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.

GHATE, P. *Direct Attacks on Rural Poverty: Policy Programmes and Implementation*. New Delhi: Concept, 1984.

GRIFFIN, K. Rural Poverty in Asia: Analysis and Policy Alternatives in Strategies for Alleviating Poverty in Rural Asia, Rizwaul Islam (Edited). *International Labour Organisation.* Bangkok: Asian Employment Programme (ARTEP), 1985.

GUPTA, A. and V.S. Vyas. Towards Fuller Rural Employment in Gujarat: Thrust, Policies and Programmes. *Indian Institute of Management*. Ahmedabad (mimeo) 1981.

HIRWAY. *Wage Employment Programmes in Rural Development: A Study of National Rural Employment Programme in Gujarat*. New Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing, 1986.

HUGHES, T.J. and D.E.T. Luard. *The Economic Development of Communist China, 1949-60* (Second Edition). London: Oxford University Press, 1981.

INSTITUTE for Financial Management and Research. An Economic Assessment of Poverty Eradiction and Rural Unemployment Programme, and their Prospects (Mimeo). Madras, 1984.

INTERNATIONAL Labour Organisation. *Profiles of Rural Poverty*. Geneva: ILO, 1979.

JHA, L.K. *Economic Strategies for the 80s*. New Delhi: Allied Publishers, 1980.

JOHN, C.H. Fer and Gustav Ranis. Development of the Labour-Surplus Economy, Theory and Policy. Yale University, 1964.

JOSHI, P.C. "Poverty, land-hunger and emerging class conflicts in rural India", In *Rural Poverty and Agrarian Reforms*, edited by S. Jones and P.C. Joshi and M. Murmis. New Delhi: Allied Publishers, 1982.

KAHN, R. "The Relation of Home Investment to Unemployment and Pace of Development", in *Selected Essays On Employment and Growth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

KALECHI, M. *Essays on Development*. Sussex: Harvester Press, 1976.

KHURRO, A.M. *Economic Development with Population Transfers: A Study in Demand for and Supply of Labour in the Non-Agricultural Sector of the Indian Economy: 1951-76*. Delhi: Asia Publishing House, 1962.

KRISHNA, R. "Concepts in Policies of Rural Development", Rural — Development in Asia and the Pacific, Vol. I, Papers and Proceedings of the ADB Regional Seminar on Rural Development: Manila: Asain Development Bank, (April 1985), 20-41.

KURIEN, G.T. Towards the Twentyfirst Century: Managing the Indian Economy, Presidential Address, Section 5: Economics, Commerce and Management, III Indian Social Science Congress. Mysore, July, 14-17, 1987.

LAKDAWALA, D.T. Growth, unemployment and poverty, Presidential address to the All India Labour Economic Conference, 31 December- 2 January, Tirupati, 1978.

LAXMINARAYAN, H. and S.S Tyagi. *Changes in Agrarian Structure in India*. New Delhi: Agricole Publishing Academy, 1982.

LELE, Uma and John W. Mallor, Technological Change,distributive bias and labour transfer in a two-sector economy. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 33 (November, 1981), 426-41.

LEWIS, W.A. "Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour", *Manchester School of Economic and Social Study*, (May 1954) 139-92

LIPTON, M. *Labour and Poverty*. Washington (DC): World Bank, (World Bank Staff, Working Paper No. 616), 1963.

LIPTON, M. *Poverty, Undernutrition and Hunger*. Washington (DC): World Bank (World Bank S taff Working Paper No. 597), 1963.

LIPTON, M. (ed.), *Rural Poverty and Agribusiness: iscussion Paper*. England, Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex: Brighton, 1977.

LIPTON, M. *Why Poor Stay Poor: A Study of Urban Bias in World Development*. London: Temple, 1977.

MACGREGOR, Susance. *The Politics of Poverty*. London: Longman, 1981.

MARTIN, C.M. Performance Review and Evaluation: 'Their Roles in the Implementation of National Development Plans (Paper prepared for the Conference of Asian Economic Planners ECAFE, September, 1971) in Garbriel U. Iglesias (ed.), *Implementation : The problem of Achieving Resnlts : A Case Book on Asian Experience*. Manila Eastern Regional Organisation for Public Administration, 1976, p. xvi.

MATHUR, K. Development of the Rural Poor: Intensions and Imp'ementation. Paper presented in 24th Annual Conference of Members of the IIPA, held on October 11, 1980, New Delhi, IIPA, 1980.

MINHAS, B.S. *Mass Poverty and the Strategy of Rural Development*. Washington, (DC): Economic Development Institute, 1971.

MYRDAL, G. *Asian Drama*, New York: Pantheon, 1968.

MYRDAL. *The Challenge of World Poverty: A World Anti-poverty Programme Outline*. London: Allen Lane, 1970, p. 518.

NAGAL, E. *Assumptions in Economic Theory in the Philosophy of Social Explanation*, edited by Alan Ryan, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.

NAIR, Kusum. *In Defence of the Irrational Peasant: Indian Agriculture after the Green Revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

NEHRU, Jawaharlal. Address to Seventh Annual General Body Meeting of Indian Institute of Public Administration, August 26, 1961. In Indian Institute of Public Administration, *Jawaharlal Nehru and Public Administration*. New Delhi: IIPA, 1975.

NURKSE, R. *Problems of Capital Formulation in Underdeveloped Countries*. London Oxford Univers y Press , 1953

O'NEIL, Onora, *Faces of Hunfer: An Essay on Poverty, Justice and*

Development. London: University of Essex, 1986.

PARTHASARATHI Rao, S.V. and G.D.R. Rao. "Character of Poverty among Rural Poor". *In Poverty: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, edited by B.S. Rao, and V.N. Deshpande. Madras: Madras Institute of Development Studies, 1982.

RAO, C.H. Hanumantha. *Technological Change and Distribution of Gains in Indian Agriculture*. New Delhi: Macmillan, 1975.

RIDKER, B.G. and L. Harold (eds.), *Employment and Unemployment Problems in the Near East and South Asia*, Delhi: Vikas, 1971.

SABATIER, P.A. and D.A. Mazananiar, "Policy Implementation", In S.S. Negal (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Policy Studies*. New York: Marcell Dekker, 1983.

SARDAR Patel Institute of Economic and Social Research, *Employment, Poverty and Public Policy*. (Memograph Series). Ahmedabad: Allied Publications, 1981.

SAU, R. *Indian Economic Growth: Constraints and Prospects*. Calcutta: Orient Longman, 1973.

SAU, R. Public Works and Private Interests. Seminar on Agrarian Structure, Agricultural Growth and Rural Development, Allahabad (Mimeo), G.B. Pant Institute, September, 1981.

SEN, A.K. *Choice of Techniques*. New York: Augustus Kolley, 1968.

SEN, A.K. *Dimensions of Unemployment in India, Convocation Address*. Calcutta: Indian Statistical Institute, 1973.

SEN, A.K. *Employment, Technology and Development*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1975.

SEN, A.K. *On Economic Inequality*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1973.

SEN, A.K. Poor, relatively speaking. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 35 (July 1983).

SEN, A.K. *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1982.

SHANIN, T. *The Awkward Glass*. London: Oxford University Press, 1972.

SHRIGERU, I. *Labour Absorption in Asian Agriculture*. (ARTEP), Bangkok: Asian Employment Programme, 1981.

SINGH, J. and R.K. Tiwari. *Managing Poverty Alleviation: Insights from the Field*. New Delhi: Indian Institute of Public Administration, 1988.

SWINDLE, L.D.A. *Time for Rainfed Agriculture*. (Coromandel Lecture) New Delhi, 10 December, 1981.

TURNHAM, D.J. and R.K. Hawkins. *The Employment Problem and World Bank Activities*. Washington (D.C.): World Bank, 1973. (World Bank Staff Working Paper No. 148), 1973.

VAKIL, C.N. and Brahmanda, *Planning for a Shortage Economy: The Indian Experiment*. Bombay: Vora, 1952.

VISARIA, P. *Poverty and Living Standards in Asia: An Overview of the*

Main Results and Lesson of Selected Household Surveys. Washington DC: World Bank, 1980.

WATERSTON, A. *Development Planning: Lessons of Experience*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1965, p. 335.

WILBER, K.C. *The Soviet Model and Underdeveloped Countries*. The University of North Carolina Press, 1969.

Reports

INDIA. Comptroller and Auditor General. *Supplementary Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the Year 1973-74*. (Part I) Union Government (Civil). New Delhi: CAG, 1975.

INDIA. Comptroller and Auditor General. *Supplementary Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1985-86*. (Part I) Union Government (Civil). New Delhi: CAG, 1987.

INDIA. Comptroller and Auditor General. *Report of Comptroller for the year 1983-84*. Union Government (Civil). New Delhi: CAG, 1985.

INDIA. Labour Bureau. *Rural Labour Enquiry, 1974-75*, Final Report, Chandigarh. Comptroller of Publications, 1979.

INDIA. Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation. *Report of the National Commission on Agriculture*, Part XIII, Rural Employment and Special Area Programme. New Delhi, 1976.

INDIA. Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation. Department of Rural Development. *Report of the Review Committee on Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Project (PIREP)*. New Delhi, August, 1977.

INDIA. Ministry of Agriculture. Department of Rural Development. National Rural Employment Programme (NREP) and Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP) Manual. New Delhi, 1966.

INDIA. Ministry of Human Resources Development. Department of Education. National Policy. Ministry of Education, 1986; Programme of Action. New Delhi, 1986.

INDIA. Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. Towards Social Justice: Employment in Rural Areas by Prof. D.R. Gadgil. New Delhi, April 1971.

INDIA. Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation. Department of Labour and Employment. *Report of the Committee on Unemployment*. New Delhi, May 1973.

INDIA. Ministry of Rural Development. *Report of the Task Force on the Drought Prone Areas Programme and the Desert Development Programme*, New Delhi, 1982.

INDIA. Ministry of Rural Reconstruction. *Report of the Study Team on Rural Employment*. New Delhi, 1979.

INDIA. Parliament, Lok Sabha (5th). Public Accounts Committee, (1974-75). Hundred and Seventieth Report. *Crash Scheme, on Rural Employment*, New Delhi: Lok Sabha Secretariat, 1975.

INDIA. Parliament, Lok Sabha (5th) Public Accounts Committee (1976-77). Two hundred and Twenty-eighth report: *Crash Scheme for Rural Employment*, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (Department of Rural Development). New Delhi. Lok Sabha Secretariat, August 1976.

INDIA. Parliament, Lok Sabha (7th) Public Accounts Committee (1981-82). Ninetieth Report: "Food for Work Programme". Ministry of Rural Development. New Delhi. Lok Sabha Secretariat, March, 1982.

INDIA. Planning Commission, National Committee on the Development of Backward Areas. *Report on Development of Drought Prone Areas and Desert Areas.* New Delhi. Planning Commission, September, 1981.

INDIA. Planning Commission. *Papers on Rural Employment, Unemployment and Underemployment.* New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1964.

INDIA. Planning Commission. *Perspective, Planning Division, A Technical Note on the Seventh Plan in India* (1985-90). New Delhi: Planning Commission, June, 1986.

INDIA. Planning Commission. *Report of the Committee of Experts on Unemployment Estimates.* New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1971.

INDIA. Planning Commission. *Seventh Five Year Plan, 1985-90*, New Delhi: Planning Commission, October, 1985.

INDIA. Planning Commission, *Seventh Five Year Plan 1985-90*, Mid-Term Appraisal. New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1988.

INDIA. Planning Commission. *Task Force on Integrated Rural Development.* Integrated Agricultural Development in Drought Prone Area. New Delhi: Planning Commission, i973.

INDIA. Planning Commission. *Task Force on Projections of Minimum Needs and Effective Consumption Demand.* New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1979.

INDIA. Planning Commission. *Programme Evaluation Organisation, Directorate of Economics and Statistics.* Joint Evaluation of Employment Guarantee Scheme of Maharashtra, October, 1977. New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1977.

INDIA. Planning Commission. *Programmes Evaluation Organisation, Directorate of Economics and Statistics.* Joint Evaluation of Employment Guarantee Scheme of Maharashtra, 1980. New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1980.

INDIA. Planning Commission. *Programme Evaluation Organisation, Evaluation Report on National Rural Employment Programme (NREP).* New Delhi: Planning Commission, March, 1987.

INDIA. Planning Commission. *Programme Evaluation Organisation,* Final Report, *Evaluation of Food for Work Programme,* (August-October, 1979). New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1980.

INDIA. Planning Commission. *Programme Evaluation Organisation,*

Report on Evaluation of Rural Manpower Projects, New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1967.

INDIA. Planning Commission. *Report of the Expert Group for Alleviation of Poverty*. New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1982.

INDIA. Planning Commission. *Programme Evaluation Organisation, Study of Crash Scheme of Rural Employment, 1971-74*. New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1979.

INDIA. Planning Commission. *Programme Evaluation Organisation, Study of Special Employment Programmes 1971-74*. New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1979.

INDIA. Planning Commission. *Programme Evaluation Organisation, Study of Special Employment Programme, 1971-74*. New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1977.

INDIAN Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR). *Alternatives in Agricultural Development*. New Delhi: Allied Publishers, 1980.

RATH, N. Reorientation of the Rural Anti-Poverty Programmes—A Note in Thoughts on Rural Development, Proceedings of the Dialogical Session of the Seminar on "Poverty Alleviation—Policy Options" in New Delhi on August 26, 1985, Vol. II, New Delhi, 1985, Department of Rural Development, Ministry of Agriculture.

WORLD Bank. *Public Works Programmes in Developing Countries: A Comparative Analysis*. Washington (D.C.): World Bank, (World Bank Staff Working Paper No. 224), 1976.

INDEX

A

All India Employment Guarantee Scheme, 149, 150

B

Block Development Officer, 72, 73, 74, 80, 82, 83, 88, 89, 91, 97, 101, 105, 107, 109, 117, 120, 130, 131, 135, 139, 140
Brahmanand, P.R., 18
Bunker, D.R., 5

C

Chakravarty, S., 1, 19, 20, 24, 25
Crash Scheme for Rural Employment, 29-32, 33, 35, 36, 39, 41, 43, 46, 51, 52, 56, 57, 58, 61

D

Dandekar, V. M., 1, 18-19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25
Dantwala, M.L., 9, 21, 22, 24
District Coordination Committee, 140
District Development Officer 74, 120, 131, 138, 140
District Rural Development Agency 67, 69, 73, 74, 77, 79, 88, 94, 95, 97, 98, 100, 103, 114, 115, 116-121, 126, 128, 129, 131, 133, 134, 137-140

E

Edward, G. C., 7

F

Food Corporation of India, 54, 55, 67, 69, 113, 115, 118, 119, 137

H

Horn Van, C.E., 7

I

Implementation: role of, 2; problem of 3; administration and politics in, 3; problem of plan, 4; framework, 7; top down approach, 7; 'bottom-up' perspective, 8; concept defined, 8-9; research on, 9
Indian Institute of Public Administration, v; 2

J

Jawahar Rozgar Yojana, 144, i45, 146

K

Khusro, A.M., 18

L

Levine, R.A., 5
Labour-cum- Development Banks, 147

M

Maharashtra Employment Guarantee Scheme, 1, 147, 149, 150
Mazmanian, D.A., 7
Meter Van, D.S., 7
Myrdal, G., 4

N

National Rural Employment Programme, 29-33, 35, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 49-50, 52-57, 59, 60, 62, 63, 144-146; administrative set-up and dysfunctionalities 70-75, 137-141; shelf of projects, 77, 127-129; annual action plan, 77-79; planning for social forestry, 79-80, 92-93, 94, 129; procedural requirements, 82-83; control and supervision 83-86; dysfunctionalities in the planning process, 86-89; incomplete works, 89-91, 130-131; rural roads, 94-95, 129-130; criteria for allocation, 96, 131, 132; pattern of release of funds, 96, 98, 131; allocation and expenditure pattern, 98; profile of schemes, 99-101; allotment of funds and valuation 101-102; earth works, 102-103; slack season, 103-104; recovery, 104, 135; wage and non-wage components, 105-106, 132; selection of labourers and payment of wages, 106-107; technical supervision, 107-108, 135-136; durability, 108-109; maintenance of the assets, 109-110, 136; people's participation, 111; utilisation of assets and technical design, 111-112; information system, 112, 137; distribution of foodgrains, 113-121, 136-137 impact of the programme, 122-125; non-utilisation of assets, 132; policy implications, 144-150.

Nehru Jawaharlal, v, 2
Nurkse, R. 1, 15-18

P

Political commitment, 4
public administration, critical role of, 5
Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Project, 35, 42, 43, 47, 48, 52, 53, 54, 59

R

Rural Employment Programmes, financing, 16-17; type of projects, 17-18; approach, 19-21; labour intensive works, 21; selection of projects, 22-24; organization, 24-25; fiscal measures, 25; evolution of the policy, 27-32; expenditure incurred, 33; physical assets 33-35; pattern of sectoral expenditure, 35; durability, 35-39; employment generation 39-41; unit cost of employment, 41-42; labour cooperatives, 42-43; participation by different groups, 43-44; planning of works, 44-51; income, 51-52; payment of wages, 52-53; impact on wages, 53-54; foodgrains distribution, 54-56; maintenance of the assets, 56-57; modifications in the guidelines, 57-61; monitoring, 61-62.
Right to Work Scheme, 147
Rural Engineering Service, 67, 69, 70-74, 84, 85, 107, 108, 110, 126, 135
Rural Landless Employment Guarantee programme, 29, 33, 35-40, 41, 50, 51, 54
Rural Works Programme 29-32, 35, 39-45, 52

Rath, N., 1, 18, 19, 20-25
Rieger, C., 5

S

Sabatier, P.A., 7
Smith, T.B., 5-6
'soft states', 4
'street level bureaucrats'' 8
'sub divisional officer' 88, 120
128, 130, 131, 140
'surplus labour', 15

T

Test Relief Works, 147

U

Unemployment, disguised 15-16
United Nation Group of Experts, 25

W

Waterston, A, 3
'war on poverty', 5